Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

SCB 11378

COLLECTION OF PURITAN AND
ENGLISH THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE

LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

0=4=0

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
FIRST and SECOND
OF THE
CANONS,
Commonly ascribed to the
Holy Apostles.

WHEREIN

An Account of the Primitive Constitution and Government of Churches, is contained.

Drawn from ancient and acknowledged Writings.

GLASGOW,
By *Robert Sanders*, Printer to the City and University, 1673.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/observations00burn

The First CANON.

Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν.

A Bishop shall be ordained by two or three Bishops.

A BISHOP.

THIS word is sometime taken for a *Spy*, so *Eustathius ad Homeri* K. sometime for a *Defender*; so *Hector* was called *Bishop* of *Troy* by *Homer*, *Iliad* ω. There was among the *Athenians* a publick Office so called: and in this sense, it was also used among the *Romans*; so *Cicero ad Atticum*, *Lib.* 7. *Epist.* 11. tells, That *Pompey* would had him to be, *quem tota campania & maritima ora habeant Episcopum, ad quem delectus & summa negotii referatur, ff. de mun. & hon. leg. ult. parag. item Episcopi sunt, qui præsunt pani & cæteris rebus vænalibus.* This

This term is sometime in the Old Testament. And *Clemens Romanus Epist. ad Rom.* proves Bishop and Deacon to be no new terms, from *Isai.* 60. 17. Καταστήσω ἐπισκόπες αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τὲς διακόνες αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει But in our Edition, we find: Δώσω τὲς ἄρχοντάς σε ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τὲς ἐπισκόπες σε ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (where, on the way, mark how different the present Edition of the *Septuagint* is, from that which *Clemens* made use of) ἐπισκοπή, is also *Psalm* 109. 8. Among the *Jews*, he who was the chief of the Synagogue, was called *Chazan hakeneseth*, the Bishop of the Congregation; and *Sheliach tsibbor*, the Angel of the Church. And the Christian Church being modelled as near the form of the Synagogue as could be, as they retained many of the Rites, so the form of their Government was continued, and the names remained the same. But more of this afterward.

Clemens Romanus in his *Epistle*, speaks only of Bishops and Deacons. *Polycarp* again in his *Epistle*, speaks only of Presbyters and Deacons; where some object that it would seem, that both in the Church of *Corinth*, to which *Clement* wrote, and in that of *Philippi*, to which *Polycarp* wrote, there were but two Orders of Churchmen, whom the one calls Bishops, the other Presbyters. But if *Polycarp's Epistle* be genuine, then those of *Ignatius*, which he there mentions, must be

be so too, and in them the matter is past Controversie.

Epiphanius lib.3. hær. 75. tells, that at first there were only Bishops and Deacons, which he saith he had ἐν βαθυτάταις ἱστορίαις; and that *ubi Episcopi erant jam constituti, scripsit Episcopis & Diaconis. Non enim omnia statim potuerunt Apostoli constituere. Presbyteris enim opus est & Diaconis, per hos enim duos Ecclesiastica compleri possunt; ubi vero non inventus est quis dignus Episcopatu, permansit locus sine Episcopo. Ubi autem opus fuit, & erant digni Episcopatu, constituti sunt Episcopi; cum autem multitudo non esset, non inventi sunt inter ipsos, qui Presbyteri constituerentur, & contenti erant solo Episcopo in loco constituto. Verum sine Diacono impossibile est esse Episcopum.* So it seems, that from these profound Histories which he had read, it appeared, that in some Villages there were only Presbyters and no Bishops, because in those places none were found worthy of it. But certainly these places were obliged to depend upon some place where there was a Bishop constitute: For if none were worthy to be Bishops, much less were they worthy to constitute a Church within themselves, and independent. It also appears, that in some places at first, they had no Presbyters: And indeed where the number of Christians was so small (as no doubt it was in many places at first) a Bishop

alone might well have served a whole City: But where the Christians were more numerous, there were need of more hands, to assist the Bishop in his work.

As for that of *Polycarp*'s naming no Bishop, but only Presbyters and Deacons, perhaps he wrote in the vacancy of the See: so we find many Letters of *Cyprian*'s *ad Clerum Romanum*, when there was no Bishop. Besides, it is known that at first the names of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were used promiscuously.

Presbyters were so called, not from their age, as they were men, but from the age of their Christianity: For a *Neophite* was not to be ordained, and the Presbyters did jointly with the Bishop, both rule and feed the flock. But some do stretch this too far, as if always the eldest Presbyter had been chosen Bishop.

The *Commentaries* upon the *Epistles*, commonly called *Ambrose*'s, but truly *Hilary*, the Deacons (of which I shall say nothing, it being now agreed among the Criticks, that they are his) upon the 4th of the *Eph.* After he hath at length shewn the difference which was betwixt the Churches in the Apostles times, when they were not fully constitute, and the ages that succeeded, he tells how at first all in the Clergy baptized and preached, and that on any day, or where they had opportunity. But afterwards

Deacons

Deacons were restrained in this, and things were astricted to certain times and places. *Hinc est ergo* (saith he) *unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, nec Clerici, nec Laici baptizant.* —— *Ideo, non per omnia conveniunt scripta Apostolica ordinationi, quæ nunc in Ecclesiâ est, quia hæc inter ipsa primordia sunt scripta. Nam & Timotheum à se creatum Presbyterum, Episcopum nominat, quia primi Presbyteri, Episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus: sed quia cœperunt præsentes Episcopi indigni inveniri, ad primatus tenendos immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum. Multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, & esset multis scandalo.* And like to this is, what he saith on 1 *Tim.*3. from which words, it would appear, that he thought the *Elder Presbyter*, without any Election or Ordination, succeeded unto the Chair of the deceased Bishop. But this is directly contrary even to what *Jerome* himself saith: neither do we find any such constitution as that he mentions, either in the Acts of the Council of *Nice*, or of any other.

It is true, *Clemens Romanus* saith, That the Apostles ordained their first fruits, τὰς ἀπαρχὰς, to be the Bishops and Deacons of them who should afterward believe: but he adds, δοκιμα-

ζόντες τῷ πνεύματι, trying them by the Spirit (that of discerning spirits being among their extraordinary gifts) and though they ordained no *Neophyte*, yet there is no reason to believe, that either they made the eldest Christians Presbyters, or the eldest Presbyters, Bishops. The choice of *Matthias*, and of the *seven Deacons*, shews that it went not simply by age. St *James* the younger was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Timothy* was but young, when ordained. Yet the difference of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* seems not to have been unknown to *Clemens*, as appears from these sayings of his, ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν, καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέροις *præpositis vestris subditi & seniores inter vos debito honore prosequentes.*— τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσθῶμεν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμῶν τιμήσωμεν. *Qui nobis præsunt revereamur, seniores inter nos honoremus*, τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδομέναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προσέταγται, καὶ λευίταις ἰδίαι διακονίαι ἐπήκονται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται Which by the words that follow, must certainly relate to some Ecclesiastical constitution among themselves, to which he accommodates the terms of the Temple Hierarchy. All which I propose without any peremptory decision in this matter, submitting it to the judgment of the impartial Reader; For I know there are

except

exceptions against these words, yet they do clearly imply a difference and subordination betwixt the *Presbyters*, and their *Presidents*: and what he saith of the ranks of the *High Priest, the Priests, the Levites, and the Laicks*, hath certainly a relation to the Orders of the Church.

The next opinion about the Origine of Episcopacy, is that of *Jerome*, and he hath given it very fully, both in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, and on the *Epist.* to *Titus*, *cap.* 1. He holds, that all things at first were governed in the Church, *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, and that the Bishops were above the Presbyters, *non ex dispositione dominicâ, sed ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine*; And by divers arguments from Scripture, he proves, that Bishop and Presbyter are one and the same, *Acts* 20. they who *v.* 17. are called *Presbyters*, are *v.* 28. called *Bishops*. *Titus* 1. 5. *he left him to ordain Elders*, and *v.* 7. it is added, *For a Bishop*, &c. Whence he infers, that Bishop and Presbyter are one and the same. As also *Phil.* 1. the Apostle writes only to Bishops and Deacons: And 1 *Tim.* 3. he gives the Rules only to Bishops and Deacons. S. *Peter* also called himself Συμπρεσβύτερος· And S. *John* designs himself the Elder.

But he adds, after there arose Schisms, and one said, I am of *Paul*, &c. *Toto orbe decretum*

est, ut unus cæteris super imponeretur ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur -- ut Schismatum plantaria evellerentur ad unum, omnis sollicitudo est delata. And *ad Evagrium*, he tells how *Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelistâ usque ad Heraclam & Dionysium, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant. --- Quid enim excepta ordinatione facit Episcopus, quod Presbyter non facit. —- Et, ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento; quod Aaron, & filii ejus, atque Levitæ, fuerunt in Templo, hoc sibi & Episcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.* And from these words we may observe, that he accounted the difference of Bishop and Presbyter, an Apostolical tradition, which came in place of the difference that was betwixt *Aaron* and his Sons: as also, that this began from the time of the Apostles, and of *Mark* the Evangelist: That it was done to evite Schism, and that it was appointed through the whole World: as also, that the whole care and chief Power was in the hands of the Bishop, of which he saith further, *Dial adv. Luciferianos. Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiâ efficientur Schismata, quot Sacerdotes.* It may seem likewise probable, from him, that Presbyters choosed their Bishop out of their

own

own number, and that in *Alexandria* they made him Bishop without any new Ordination. And of this *Eutychius Patriarcha Alex.* who was not very long after *Jerome*, speaks more plainly, for he in his *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*, published by *Selden*, *pag.*29.30. tells, that there were twelve Presbyters constitute by S. *Mark*, and when the See was vacant, they did chuse one of their number to succeed, and to be their Head, and the rest laid their hands upon him, and bless'd him: yet this cannot hold true, as shall afterwards appear.

But all *Ignatius* his *Epistles*, are full of the subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, not without very hyperbolical magnifications of the Bishops Office. It is true, in the *vulgar Editions* these expressions are much more frequent; but in the *Medicean Codex* (published by *Vossius*, which agrees not only with the old Latin one published by *Usher*, but also with the citations of *Theodoret*, and *Athanasius*, and other ancient Writers which they have taken out of them) there is a great deal of the subordination of Presbyters to Bishops. *Ep. ad Tral.* he saith, *Necessarium est, quemadmodum facitis sine Episcopo nihil operari. —Omnes revereantur Episcopum ut Jesum Christum existentem filium Patris, Presbyteros autem, ut concilium Dei, & conjunctionem Apostolorum.* To the *Ephes.* he bids them be subject τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ,

ἐν πρεσβυτείῳ, and concludes that they should obey these ἀπειθοῦσῳ διανοίᾳ. In his *Epist.* to the *Magnesians*, he saith, *Quantum Episcopum quidem vocant, sine ipso autem omnia operantur:* wherefore he adviseth them, *ut omnia operentur præsidente Episcopo in loco Dei, & Presbyteris in loco confessionis Apostolorum.* And there he speaks of the age of *Damas* their Bishop, who was but a young man, which he calls according to the vulgar Edition, τὴν φαινομένην νεότητα, but in the *Medicean Codex*, τὴν φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, from which some will infer, that Episcopacy was then newly invented, but suppose that were the true reading, which some question, who in this prefer the vulgar reading, it is clear from the whole Epistle that he is speaking of the Bishops age, and not of Episcopacy. And from 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. we see νεωτερικὴ is properly youthful, and καινὴ is that which is new. And what tho *Ignatius*, who lived so near the Apostles time, did call Episcopacy *a new Order?* Many other places to the same purpose of the difference among these Offices occur through all his Epistles, neither is there any room for debate: but if these Epistles be his, the difference of Bishop and Presbyter hath begun in the Apostolical times. But that debate would prove too long a digression here; therefore I refer the Reader, if he desire a full discussion of that question to the in-

incomparably learned and exact defence of them, lately published by *Doctor Pearson*, whose harvest is so full, that he hath not so much as left work for a gleaner.

That of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, is brought by many, and that not without ground, to prove that there was some singular person in these Churches to whom each Epistle was directed, and we have a great deal of reason to believe that *Polycarp* was then Bishop of the Church of *Smyrna*. *Iren. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. and *apud Euseb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 13. tells that *Polycarp* was ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καθιερωθείς. Now *Irenæus* tells how he was *Polycarp* his hearer and disciple, and had conversed with him in his youth, and had often heard him teach. And as it were great uncharitableness to suspect the truth of his narration in a matter of fact, so we cannot think he could have been mistaken in a matter of that importance. But whatever jealousie may fix upon *Irenæus*, there is no shadow of ground, for suspecting either the veracity, or good information of the Church of *Smyrna*, who (giving an account of his Martyrdom in an Epistle inserted by *Euseb.* in his History, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 14.) call him Bishop of the Catholick Church of *Smyrna*.

All that can be alledged against this, is, that in their stile *Bishop* and *Presbyter* were one and the

the same thing. But the contrary of this is clear from *Irenæus*, who speaks always of Bishops as distinct from Presbyters: and tho he sometimes call Bishops *Presbyters*, yet he never calls Presbyters, *Bishops*; which is also the stile of these few Writers of that age, who sometimes call Bishops, *Presbyters*. *Eusebius* tells from the testimony of the Church of *Lions*, how he was first a Presbyter in *Lions* under *Pothinus*: after whose Martyrdom he succeeded him in the Chair, and died Bishop there. And if we will hear himself, *lib.*3. *cap.* 3. when he is reckoning up the tradition of the Faith from the Apostles, he deduceth it by all the Bishops who did sit in *Rome* from the Apostolick times: whence two things will follow; one, that he judged there had been still Bishops in that Church. The other, that he looked on the Bishop, as the chief depositary of the faith.

Further, *Euseb. lib.*5. *cap.* 24. sets down his Epistle to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, wherein he chides him for excommunicating the *Eastern* Bishops; and there he lays the whole blame upon *Victor*, without sharing it among the Presbyters, and also commends the former Bishops of *Rome* for their greater gentleness; whereby it plainly appears, that he judged that the power of discipline lay chiefly in the Bishops hands. *Polycrates* also (*apud Euseb. lib.* 5. *hist. cap.* 23.) vindi-

vindicates the practice of their Church about the day of *Easter, not only from the example of the Apostles among them, but of the seven Bishops who preceded him in his See.* From which we may not only infer, that there was but one Bishop in a City, from the days of the Apostles; but that his authority was great, since what they did, passed for a precedent to their Successors. And indeed the difference of Bishop and Presbyter, is so evpress in *Irenæus*, that the most learned assertors of parity, confess the change was begun before his time, which was in the end of the second *Century.* Now how this change could have been introduced, when there was neither Council, nor secular Prince to establish it, when Churchmen were so pure (*Polycarp* an Apostolical Man, having died but about thirty years before; besides many other Apostolical men who had long survived) when the Church was in the fire of persecution, and so less dross could be among them; when there was no secular interest to bait them to it: for on the contrary this subjected them to the first fury of the persecution; seems strange. And it is not easie to be imagined, or believed, how this could have been so suddenly received through all the Churches, both *Eastern* and *Western*, and that there was none to witness against it; and that neither the sincerity of some Presbyters, nor the pride

of

of others, should have moved them to appear for their priviledges against this Usurpation: And how neither Heretick, nor Schismatick, save one, and that about two hundred years after, should have charged the Church with this: on the contrary, all of them having their own Bishops; and how this Government continued in so peaceable possession through the succession of so many ages, till of late, that even fundamentals are brought under debate; if this Superiority were either so criminal, as some hold it to be, or had not been introduced at least by some Apostolical men, if not by the Apostles themselves, will not be easily cleared.

In the next *Century* we have *Tertullian* speaking clearly of the difference of *Bishops, Presbyters* and *Deacons, lib. de bapt. Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui & Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen sine Episcopi authoritate, propter Ecclesiæ bonum.* Idem *de præscript. adverſ. hær. cap.* 32. *Cæterum si quæ* (præscriptiones) *se audent inferere ætati Apostolicæ, ut ita videantur ab Apostolis traditæ. — Edant ergo origines Ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus, aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseverarent, habuerit authorem & antecessorem; hoc enim modo Ecclesiæ Apostolicæ census suos deferunt,*

ferunt, sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia habens Polycarpum, à Joanne collocatum refert: sicut Romanorum à Petro Clementem ordinatum edit. Proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatu constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeant; confingant tale aliquid hæretici. He also *lib.* 4. *cont. Marcionem, cap.* 5. saith, *Ordo tamen Episcoporum ad originem recensus, in Joannem stabit authorem.* By which we see that he both judged Bishops to be of an Apostolical origene, and that he counted them different from Presbyters. A little after him was *Clemens Alex.* who 6. *Strom.* p. 667. speaking of the Constitution of the Christian Churches, saith, there were among them σεμνοπαὶ ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων, which he thinks was taken from the Angelick glory, and from their Oeconomy and administration.

We shall also find through all *Cyprian* his Epistles this disparity so clear, that it cannot be denied, that yet we find him as condescending as any. *Epist.* 6. writing to his Clergy: he saith, *Solus rescribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis meæ, privata gerere sententia.* But even this looks like a yielding to a diminution of that plenitude of power to which he might have pretended, *Epist.* 65. writing to *Rogatian*, who had advised with him concerning a Deacon

that

that had carried insolently toward him, he writes: *Pro Episcopatûs vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate, haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari.* (and about the end) *Hæc sunt enim initia hæreticorum, & ortus atque conatus Schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, ut præpositum superbo tumore contemnant, sic de Ecclesiâ receditur, sic altare profanum foris collocatur, sic contra pacem CHRISTI, & ordinationem, atque unitatem DEI rebellatur.* Likewise we find *Epist.* 31. written to *Cyprian*, by the *Clerus Romanus*, the Seat being then vacant, what sense they had of the Bishop's power, when they say: *Post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui lapsi sunt possit cum authoritate & consilio habere rationem.* And if in any case we receive a testimony, it should be from the mouth of those who can only pretend to be injured. My next witness shall be *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, whose fame and authority was inferiour to none of the age he lived in. I do not bring his words to prove there were Bishops in the Church in his time, since that is denied by none: But to prove how full and absolute the authority of the Bishops was then, and that the Presbyters were simply determined by their commands. Great care was used to keep the Christian Assemblies pure; and

there-

therefore such as fell in scandalous sins, chiefly these who apostatised in the persecution, were not admitted to the Communion of the faithful, but after a long and heavy penitence: And a question rising, What should be done with those who died before they finished their penitence: he in his Letter to *Fabius* Bishop of *Rome*, telling that signal story of *Serapion*, shews that in his Diocese the Presbyters sent the Eucharist to the sick who desired it, though they died before they had compleated their penitence: and he adds how this was by his authority, ἐντολὴν δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ διδομένην, τὸν ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον· ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν ἀφέσεως· ἵν' ἐλπίδες ἀπαλλάττωνται. Where from the stile of *a Command given by him, which was the rule of his Presbyters*, and the rest of that Epistle, it is as clear as any matter of fact can be, that the authority of *Bishops over their Presbyters was then full, absolute, and undisputed.*

If we will believe *Eusebius*, who certainly hath been a diligent and great Collector, as any of all the Ancients, the whole Tract, both of his History and Chronology, runs fully in this strain; and he gives us the Catalogues of the Bishops of the Patriarchal Sees, from the days of the Apostles to his own time. And tho it is not to be denied that he hath been too credulous in some instances; yet it is hard to think he could

could have been mistaken in such a Tract of so many particulars. And we see from the sixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. That the power of *Metropolitans* over Bishops, was then accounted by that Council an ancient Custom; neither was there ever any opposition made to this before *Aërius*, who upon that account is reckoned an Heretick by *Epiph. lib. 3. hær. 75.* and also by *Augustin ad Quod vult Deum, hær. 53. Epiphanius* adds, that he was an *Arrian*, and gives the account of his Opinion in this matter, thus: *Aërius* being a Presbyter in *Sebastia*, was offended when *Eustathius* was preferred before him to that Bishoprick: and tho *Eustathius* took all ways to gain him, and committed the *Xenodochium* that was there to his inspection, yet *Aerius* too deeply irritated at the preference, said: *Quid est Episcopus ad Presbyterum; nihil differt hic ab illo, unus enim est honor, unus ordo, & una dignitas. Imponit munus Episcopus, ita etiam Presbyter; lavacrum dat Episcopus, similiter & Presbyter. Dispensationem cultûs divini facit Episcopus, facit & Presbyter similiter; sedet Episcopus in throno, sedet etiam Presbyter.* By which he deceived many, and had divers followers: but it seems they have died with their Author, for we hear no more of them.

Medina in the Council of *Trent*, numbred with *Aerius*, *Jerome*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Chry-*

Chrysostom, *Theodoret*, *Primasius*, and *Sedulius*, as if they had been of the same mind, wherein he certainly spoke rashly, and was either ignorant or indeliberate. We have already considered both *Jerome* and *Ambrose*, or rather *Hilary* the Deacon, their opinions in this matter.

All that is gathered from *Augustine*, is, *Ep. ad Hieronymum*, where he saith: *Quanquam secundum honorem vocabulorum, quæ jam usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major fit, multis tamen in rebus Augustino Hieronymus major est.* Whence some would infer that the difference of these was only in words, and brought in but by custom: But how thin and weak this is, it being but a smooth Complement, will appear to all, especially if they set it in the balance with the great evidence that stands upon the other side.

Chrysostom hom. 11. on 1 *Tim.* when he is giving the reason, why the Apostle passeth from Bishops to Deacons, without giving rules to Presbyters, saith, the reason was, ὅπ ἐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον, ϗ γὰρ, ϗ ἄυλοι διδασκαλίαν ἀνασδεδγμένοι, ϗ φροντασίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. And a little after, he taxeth what that little betwixt them was, τῇ γὰρ χειροτοία μόνη ἀυτῶν ὑπερβεβήκασι, ϗ τότῳ μόνῳ δόκεσι πλεονεκτεῖν τὰς πρεσβυτέρους. But this is far from saying that they were all one; and that there ought to be no difference betwixt

them. *Chrysost.* also in his first Homily on the *Phil.* 1. *cap.* on the word σὺν ἐπισκόποις, saith, *Quid hoc rei est? An unius Civitatis plures erunt Episcopi? nullo modo. Verum sic Presbyteros vocavit, tunc enim nomina invicem communicabant, & Diaconus dicebatur Episcopus.* And there he shews that Bishop and Presbyter were taken promiscuously; for which he cites that of *Timothy*'s being ordained by the Imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, which he saith is to be understood of Bishops. *Quia Presbyteri Episcopum non ordinassent.* (And a little after) *Etiam Presbyteri olim appellabantur Episcopi, & Diaconi Christi, & Episcopi Christi, unde nunc etiam multi Presbyteri & Diaconi scribuntur Episcopi.* But he adds, that in process of time, each had their proper names appropriated to them.

OEcumeneus and *Theophylact*, in this, and all other things, follow *Chrysostom* καὶ πόδας. As also *Primasius*, who on 1 *Tim.* 3. gives the reason, why the Presbyters are not named. *Eos in Episcoporum ordine comprehendit, quia secundus, imo pene unus est gradus.* *Sedulius Scotus* on the 1. of *Titus*, saith *verbatim*, that which *Jerome* hath on the same place, and so it is to be considered as all one with him on the matter.

But *Theodoret*'s opinion is a little more perplext, who on 1 *Tim.* tells, that *the same persons were called sometimes Presbyters, sometimes Bishops:*

Bishops: but these who are now called Bishops, were then called Apostles, and that in the progress of time they left the name of Apostles, and the name of Bishops was appropriated to them who were first called Apostles. Thus he. These words it seems dropped from him without consideration, for there is no shadow of ground to believe it was so; otherwise how came it, that the Apostle gave no rules for them, under that name. But these words are sufficiently tossed by *Petavius* and *Wallo Messalinus.* And thus far we have an ingenuous account of the various Sentiments of the *Fathers,* about the disparity of *Bishops* and *Presbyters.*

The next thing in this *Canon* to be consider'd is, what is meant by χειροτονία. It is unquestionable, that by this is understood Ordination by Imposition of hands, for all the Ancients use χειροτονία, & χειροθεσία promiscuously: But Criticks judge that by the former we are to understand all that pertained to the Ordination, and the whole Office of it, and that the latter is to be restrained to that particular rite of Imposition of hands given in the Ordination. Nor do I remember of any place, where χειροτονία stands for the Election of Churchmen, except in the fifth *Canon* of *Laodicea,* which discharges it to be in the presence of the hearers: and if we compare that with the 13th *Canon* of the same

Council, which discharges the popular elections, we shall see the reason why they likewise forbid the elections to be in the peoples hearing, which was for avoiding tumults. *Balsamon* on this *Canon* refutes their mistake, who understood it περὶ ψήφου, which was διὰ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἔκτασιν, who founded their gloss on that *Canon* of *Laodicea*, (which *Zonaras* and *Aristenus* doth) *Quæ enim fit in Ecclesia ordinatio per preces mysticas peragitur, etiamsi fiat coram multis.* And he proves his gloss from the 4. *Canon* of *Nice*, which appoints the elections of the Bishops to be by the whole Bishops of the Province, or by three at least. Therefore this *Canon* cannot be meant of the elections of Bishops, since two suffice by this rule for a χειροτονία; and by the recurring of this same word in the next *Canon*, he confirms his assertion, since Presbyters and Deacons were not (according to him) elected by Suffrages. Whence we see, how groundless a nicety theirs is, who would distinguish them, as if the former had been the election, the latter the ordination. It is true χειροτονέω is in the *Greek* Authors almost constantly taken for the election of Magistrates, which was ordinarily done in *Greece* by the extention or elevation of the hand; so *Budæus* upon the word, and *Cicero pro Flacco* speaks of their *psephismata porrigenda manu, profundendoq; clamore concitata.* But that distinction

is

is not observed in sacred Writings, in which these minute critical Modes of speaking are not attended to, and since, before they were to lay on hands, they were to stretch forth their hands on the head of the person, this word is not improperly used for that action: and therefore, *Acts* 14. 23. χειροτονήσαντες is used of *Paul* and *Barnabas* their ordaining of Elders, where it is clear, it cannot be meant of the election by the people, but of their Ordination of Pastors.

This word in Scripture is also used for an appointment, or election, *Acts* 10. 41. προχειροτονέω is taken for GOD's election; and 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. it is applied to these who were chosen to carry a Message. As for the Ordination of Churchmen, it is nothing else but *a solemn Ceremony of blessing them, by laying on of hands.* We find of old, that all who were called out for any Divine Service, were solemnly separated for it, so were both Kings, Priests, and Prophets. And the Law of Nature saith, that to all Functions for which a great veneration is due, there should be a solemn Inauguration. The laying of the hand upon the head, was the rite of Benediction, *Gen.* 48. 14. *Jacob* blessing *Joseph*'s Children doth it with that Ceremony: In like manner, *Deut.* 34. 19. did *Moses* bless *Joshuah.* We see also by the sinners laying on their hands on the head of the Sacrifice, that is was a Cere-

mony used in the devoting of things to GOD, whence might rise that phrase among the *Latins caput devovere.* And upon these accounts, this was appropriated to the Ordination of Churchmen, who are to be both blessed, and devoted to GOD.

We find this ceremony also used in the New Testament on many and different occasions; sometimes when they healed diseases, *Mark* 16. 8. *They shall lay their hand on the sick, and they shall recover.* And our LORD usually touched the sick with his hand. *Acts* 28. 8. S. *Paul* lays his hands on *Publius.* Likewise, when they conferred the holy Ghost on any who were baptized, they used this ceremony, so *Acts* 8. 17. *and* 19. 6. And farther, when they appointed any for the Ministery of the Gospel, they separated and blessed them, by the laying on of hands; so 1 *Tim.* 4. 15. *and* 5. 22. *and* 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Deacons were also ordained by this ceremony, *Acts* 6. 6. As also when they sent any on a particular mission, though already sanctified for the work of the Gospel, they laid hands on them: so *Acts* 13. 3. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ordained for the Ministery of the *Gentiles.* From all which it is clear that they used imposition of hands, as the constant ceremony of Benediction, and as a concomitant of it, and not as a ceremony of it self significant and sacramental.

Among

Among the Ancients, Imposition of hands was used not only in Confirmation, which is undoubted, and is by many founded on that of *Hebrews* 6. 2. where laying on of hands being joined with Baptism, and reckoned among foundations, seems to be common to all Christians. But they also used it in the receiving of penitents: so 19th Canon of *Laodicea*.

As for the form of ordaining Bishops, we see here it was to be done by Bishops, which is agreed to by all, only *Eutychius* seems to say, that in *Alexandria* Presbyters ordained the Bishop. But as for the number of the Bishops who were to ordain, this seems to be later, and more suitable to the state of the Churches after they were constituted, than while they were under persecution. The number of three was appointed, *Conc. Arel.* 1. *Can.* 21. *Nic. Can.* 4. *Arel.* 2. *Can.* 5. *Carth.* 2. *Can.* 12. And see more of this *Gratian dist.* 64. This seems to have been founded on *Timothy*'s Ordination, which is said to have been done by the Presbytery, which *Chrysostom* understands of a Company of Bishops. But it is not probable, that in the time of persecution, when Bishops neither durst leave their own flocks, nor meet in any number, this was then observed; and divers accounts are given of Ordinations, where we hear only of one Bishop ordaining. *Gregory Thaumaturg* was

ordained by *Fidimus* Bishop of *Amasia*, who went to the Wilderness to seek him. And there are many instances among the Lives of the Solitaries, of such as were brought to a Bishop, and ordained by him, without any other assisting him. So *Synesius Epist.* 67. tells how *Siderius* was ordained a Bishop, only by *Philo* Bishop of *Cyrene*; and tho he call that a Transgression of the ἀκριβεία, and confesseth it was not ἐνθέσμως, but ἐνθέσμως, since he was neither ordained in *Alexandria*, nor by three Bishops; yet he justifies it from the necessity of the times wherein such freedom of Assemblies was not safe. And *Gregory the Great* allowed *Augustine* to ordain alone in *England*; who upon that did ordain some Bishops alone, as *Beda* relates. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite cap.* 5. *de Eccles. hierar.* giving the account of the Ordination of Bishops, represents it as done by one person. *Anno* 555. after *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome* his death, *Pelagius* who got himself made his Successor, being suspected of accession to his death, could only get two Bishops, to wit, *Joannes Perusinus*, and *Bonus Ferentinus*, who with *Andreas* Presbyter of *Ostia*, laid hands on him. And here is a Presbyter laying hands on a Bishop. The Church of *Rome*, at this day, ordinarily dispenseth with this, so that one Bishop and two Abbots do often ordain Bishops.

The

The *Areopagite loc. cit.* gives the account of the Bishops Ordination, whom he always calls ἱερεχθὲς, thus: *He who was to be ordained, was brought to another Bishop, and kneeling before the Altar, the Gospels were laid on his head, and the Bishops hand, and so he was consecrated with a holy Prayer, and then marked with the sign of the cross; and last of all, saluted by the Bishop, and whole holy Order.* His Theory on this is: *Their coming to the Altar, shews the subjecting of their whole life to GOD. Laying on of hands, is as a Father's blessing of his Child. The sign of the cross signifies, that they are to follow CHRIST, even to the cross. Their salutation signifies their union one with another: and the Gospel is laid on the Bishops head, because he being the head of the Hierarchy, is to illuminate the rest.*

With this agrees the fourth Council of *Carthage*, where the rules are at length set down for the tryals and qualifications of Bishops: and Canon first, at the end, we have, *Cum in his omnibus, examinatus, fuerit inventus plene instructus, tunc cum consensu Clericorum & laicorum, & conventu totius provinciæ Episcoporum, maximeq; Metropolitani vel authoritate vel præsentiâ, ordinetur Episcopus.* And Canon second: *Episcopus quum ordinatur, duo Episcopi ponant & teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput & cervicem* (aliter *verticem*) *ejus, & uno super eum fundente benedictionem,*

reliqui

reliqui omnes Episcopi, qui adsunt, manibus suis caput ejus tangant. And of this see *Gratian dist.* 23. & 77. where we find a Bishop was to be five years a *Lector* or *Exorcist*, fourteen years an *Acoluth* or *Subdeacon*, and five years a *Deacon*, ere he be a *Presbyter*, and then he may hope for the highest degree. But in another Chapter it is said, he must be ten years a *Presbyter*, ere he can be a *Bishop*. And in another Chapter, none could be a *Deacon* under twenty five years of age. But by the Civil Law, the age both of Bishop and Presbyter is the same; to wit, thirty five. These previous degrees were introduced, and the years of tryal in them were appointed, that all might be prepared and rightly formed before they were admitted to the government of the Church. Among other ceremonies in the ordination of Bishops, in some places they were anointed with the *Chrisma*. *Nazianz. Orat.* 20. tells, that his father had so anointed *Basile:* and *Orat.* 5. tells, that himself was so ordained: but it seems that that was a custom peculiar to that Country, since we meet not with it so early elsewhere.

As for the elections of Bishops, we have seen from *Jerome* and *Eutychius*, how the Presbyters did choose the Bishop. But in *Africk*, the Synod with the Clergy, and the people did it; of which we have a full account from *Cyprian, epist.* 68.

68. *De traditione divinâ & Apostolicâ observatione tenendum est, & observandum quod apud nos quoque, & fere per Provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus delegatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, & uniuscujusq; actum de ejus conversatione perspexerit.* And a little before, he saith, *Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel elegendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi.* And from that of *Numb.* 10. where *Moses* stript *Aaron*, and clothed *Eleazer* before all the Congregation, he proves that it was of divine Authority, that the sacerdotal ordinations should not be, *nisi sub populi assistentis conscientiâ, ut plebe præsente, vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur, & sit ordinatio justa & legitima, quæ omnium judicio & suffragio erit examinata.* And this course, he saith, held in the ordination both of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. And *Epist.* 33. he excuseth himself, that he had ordained one a Lector without the consent of his people, though he had been a Confessor in the persecution. the Epistle is directed to the Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole people, and begins: *In ordinationibus Clericus solemus vos ante consulere, & mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.*

All

All that we meet with concerning this in Scripture, is the chusing of the Deacons by the people, *Acts* 6. for that of *Acts* 14.23. is clearly misapplied. 1 *Tim.* 3. a Deacon should be first approved and *Titus* 1. 6. a Bishop must be ἀνεπίλημπτος; and thereby it appears, that certainly some enquiry was to be made into his Conversation, which at least must have been a Promulgation beforehand. So we find *Conc. Chalc. can.* 6. ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἐπικηρύττοιτο. And *Lampridius* in the life of *Alexander Severus* tells, that he used such a course before he made any Governor of a Province. *Dicebatque grave esse non fieri in Provinciarum rectoribus, cum id Christiani & Judæi facerent in prædicandis Sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt.*

But there were frequent disorders in these elections, which occasioned the 13. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖαν: and by the Canon goeth before that, the election of Bishops is committed to the Bishops of the Province, which was also established by the Council of *Nice*, fourth and sixth Canon. Likewise *Justinian*, *Nov.* 123. *cap.* 1. excludes the people from the election of the Bishop, but leaves it to the Clergy, and the *primores Civitatis*, to name a list of three, out of which the *Metropolitan was to choose one.* The Bishops were to be ordained in the presence of the

the People, where every one might propose his exceptions, why he might not be ordained, which were to be examined before they proceeded to the Ordination. So *Conc. Antioch. Canon* 19. and *Carthag. Canon* 49. and *Justinian tit.* 1. *Nov. Const.* 1, 2. 17. according to *Photius in Nomocan, tit.* 1. *cap.* 8. Yet these popular elections were not wholly taken away, and at least the peoples consent was asked: but there were great disorders in these elections. *Nazianz. Orat.* 14. at his Father's Funeral instanceth them in two cases at *Cesarea,* where his Father was present; in which there were factions at the election of the Bishop: In one of them it was that *Basil* was chosen.

Ammian Mercellin tells what tumults were at *Rome* in the elections of their Bishops, of whom he saith, *Supra modum humanum ad rapiendam sedem Episcopalem ardebant:* So that at the election of *Damasus* the faction betwixt his electors, and those that were for *Urcisinus,* brake out into such a tumult, that there were *in Basilicâ Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est Conventiculum, centum triginta septem peremptorum cadavera reperta, lib.* 27. And he adds, It was no wonder they struggled so about it, because *id adepti futuri sunt ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspectè vestiti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia*

Re-

Regales superent mensas, qui esse poterant beati revera, si urbis magnitudine despecta quam vitiis opponunt, ad imitationem quorundam provincialium Antistitum viverent, quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissimè, vilitas etiam indumentorum & supercilia humum spectantia perpetuo Numini, verisque ejus cultoribus, ut puros commendant & verecundos.

Because of those disorders in elections, it was that *Nazianz. Orat.* 19. wished, that the elections were only or chiefly in their hands who served at their Altar. *Sic enim nunquam Ecclesiis male esset.* Therefore he desires they should no more be committed *iis qui opibus ac potentiâ pollent aut plebis impetui ac temeritati, atque etiam plebeiorum vilissimo aut contemptissimo cuique*, as had been before. Adding, that the disorders which were in such elections, made him loath his life, and long to be in a Wilderness.

One effect of these confused elections was, that some who were not Presbyters, nay not so much as Christians, were chosen Bishops: for *Orat.* 20. on *Basil*, when he tells how *Basil* was first ordained a Presbyter, he regrates that many Bishops oft-times leaped into the Chair without any preceding degree, which was contrary to Nature and Reason, since among Saylors none is made at first a Pilot: nor is there any at first made a General among Soldiers. *Nunc autem periculum est, ne ordo omnium sanctissimus,*

omnium

omnium maximè sit ridiculus: non enim virtute magis, quàm maleficio, & scelere Sacerdotium paratur, nec digniorum, sed potentiorum throni sunt. Adding, that none is called a Physician, before he understand diseases, nor a Painter before he can mix colors. *Antistes contra facile invenitur, non elaboratus, sed recens.---Uno die sancto fingimus, eosque sapientes & eruditos esse jubemus, qui nihil didicerunt: nec ad Sacerdotium quicquam prius contulerunt quam velle.* And *Orat.* 19. he tells how in *Cesarea* at an election of a Bishop, his Father and other Bishops being present, there arose a great sedition about it, which could not be easily composed, partly thorow the peoples fervor about the Faith, partly thorow the eminence of the Chair, which made the contentions greater. But at length the whole people with one consent made choice of a person of great quality, but not yet baptized, to be their Bishop: from which he was very averse, but they took him by force, and by the assistance of some Soldiers then in the City, haled him to the Church, and desired the Bishops, not without threats, to ordain him: whereupon they overawed by fear and force, first purified him, and then set him upon the Throne; but more with their hands than with their heart. *Chrysost.* also *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio, cap,* 15. shews the evil of these popular elections, and that in them

them they looked more to riches and honor, than to true worth.

But where the Synodical elections were set up, the People were not wholly excluded from their interest in the choice, as we see particularly in the Churches of *Milan* and *Hippo*. Neither were these Synodical elections so regular as *Nazianzen* hoped, which appears from two famous Instances of *Nectarius* and *Ambrosius*.

Nectarius came to the Council of *Constantinople* in the company of *Diodorus* Bishop of *Tarsus*: and then it was, that upon some differences (as you shall see afterwards) *Nazianzen* retired from *Constantinople*. And *Nectarius* thinking to go home to his Country, came to his Bishop *Diodorus* to ask his blessing, and receive his commands. But at that time all *Diodorus* thoughts were, how a fit Person might be found for *Constantinople*, and looking on *Nectarius*, considering his Gravity, his gray Hairs, and sweet Temper, he thought (it seems by a Divine Inspiration) what if he were made Bishop. And thereupon pretending another errand, he took him to the Bishop of *Antioch*, and whispering him in the Ear, bid him consider how fit a Person *Nectarius* might prove for the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*. *Meletius* laughed in his heart at *Diodorus* his simplicity, who should think

think of *Nectarius*, when so many famous Men had been named for that See by their Bishops. After that, *Theodosius* the Emperor commanded the Synod to give him in writing a list of such persons as were judged fit for that Chair, which being laid upon *Miletus* to draw, he to gratifie *Diodorus*, puts *Nectarius* among them. The Emperor at first reading began to think of *Nectarius:* but at second reading, positively concluded that he must be the Bishop. The Synod was amazed, and began to enquire about him, and found that he was but a *Catechumen*, whereupon they desired the Emperour to change his mind; but he continuing resolute, the Synod yielded: and after they had baptized him, they ordained him Bishop. And by this we see that the Synod made the list, but the *Emperour* named the person.

Near of kin to this is the story of *Ambrose*. After *Auxentius* the Bishop of *Milan* his death, *Valentinian* the Emperor called a Council of Bishops, and appointed them to chuse some holy and fit person to be Bishop there, *Cujus authoritati & nos subjiciamur, cujusq; reprehensiones ferre non dubitemus. Etenim ut Imperatores nos simus, & rerum potiamur, homines tamen esse nos, & humanis lapsibus obnoxios fatendum nobis est.* But the Synod referred the Election back to him, that he might name the person, yet he refused it,

and told them, it was their business, adding, *Ego vero, id & viribus meis majus & ab officio meo alienum judico.* But as they went to consult about this, the people of *Milan* did all run together to the Church to chuse their Bishops, some of them were *Arrians*, and others *Orthodox*, and each party was contending to have the Bishop chosen of their own side. At that time *Ambrose* a Noble *Roman* of the Consular Order, was Prefect there, to whom *Valentinian*, when he sent him to that charge, said, *Vade, age non ut Judex, sed ut Episcopus.* He fearing that the concourse of the people might end in a Tumult, came among them to prevent that, and with great sweetness exhorted them to calmness and unity; whereupon they much taken with his Speech, cryed out with one accord; *Let Ambrose be Bishop.* But he resisted this as much as he could, and did chide them for their indeliberate choice of a secular person, who was a stranger to Ecclesiastical affairs, and not so much as initiated into the faith, for he was not then baptized. Yet the Synod approving of their Election, he was first baptized, and then ordained Bishop. But *Paulinus* adds, that after his Baptism, he past in order through all the Ecclesiastical degrees, and on the eighth day was ordained Bishop there. Thus went the Synodical Elections: but it was a great while before that, even in the Elections of the

the Bishops of *Rome*, the people were wholly barred from their priviledges. And of all this see at large *Antonius de Dominis, lib.* 3. *de Repub: Eccles. cap.* 3.

Metropolitans were chosen by the Patriarchs, and the Patriarchs by the Emperours: but in some cases, the Emperours took the Elections simply to themselves; at other times, they reserved only the ratification of them to themselves: and so for a great while, the Elections of the Bishops of *Rome* were to be ratified, either by the Emperors of the *East*, or by their *Exarchs* at *Ravenna*. And after that *Charles the Great* assumed the Empire of the *West*, it was decreed in a Synod at *Rome*, that the Election of the *Roman* Bishop belonged to him: and accordingly he was in possession of it, though his Successors did simply slip from it. Now the Elections are in the hands of the Canons and Prebends, which is an art to make the Election go what way the Superior will. But the Chapters chusing the Bishop, was not known to the Ancients, it belonging to the whole College of the Presbyters without distinction. And all who desire the restitution of Church discipline, think, that the erecting of Provincial Synods, and giving the power of electing Bishops to them, is both the best method, and most agreeable to all Antiquity.

A See was not to lie vacant over three months, nor the ordination of a Bishop delayed, except upon an inexcusable necessity, otherwise the Metropolitan was liable to Censure, *Conc. Chalc. Can.* 25. and in the Council of *Sardice*, *Can.* 10. *Osius* proposed, that none should be Bishop till he had passed through all the inferior degrees, and had finished the Ministery of a Lector, Deacon, and Presbyter; and to this all the Bishops there present gave their consent: but by the instances already marked, we see that this order was not universally observed. *Nov.* 123. it is decreed, that a Bishop be at least three months among the Clergy, before he be ordained, that he may be instructed in the Ecclesiastical Ministery and service.

Another Custom there had been of Bishops ordaining Successors for themselves: so *Euseb. lib.* 7. *cap.* 26. or according to the *Greek* division, κεφ. 28. tells how *Theotecnus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, ordained *Anatolius* to be his Successor, and that for some time they were both Bishops together. In other places they did not ordain, but only design their Successors. Yet *Augustin* was ordained Bishop of *Hippo* by his Predecessor *Valerius*; but he apologizes for this, *Epist.* 110. and saith, that he did not know that it was contrary to the Council of *Nice*, which decreed that there should be but one Bishop at once in a City.

City. And from that Epistle we see it was ordinary for Bishops to design their Successors, which was done to prevent the tumults were usually in Elections. And *Augustin* tells us of a disorder which had been in a neighbor Town, because the Bishop, though he had designed his Successor, yet had not published it. Therefore he to evite that hazard, designed *Eradius* to be his Successor, to which all the people assented. Yet lest this might have opened a door for Bishops to have transmitted their Sees to their kindred or Friends, it was decreed in the Council of *Antioch*, *Can.* 23. that any such designation of Successors made by Bishops, should be declared null, and that the Election of the Bishop should be in the hands of the Bishops of that Synod where the See lay.

There might be but one Bishop in a City for Unities sake, yet sometimes there were Coadjutors: so *Nazianzen* was Coadjutor to his Father. And *Augustin* in his second Conference with the *Donatists*, offered that if the *Donatists* overcame, then they should yield their Bishopricks to them; but if the *Donatists* were overcome by them, and so should return to the community of the Church, they should admit them to be conjunct Bishops with them. So was the Schism in *Antioch* betwixt the *Meletianists* and the *Paulianists* setled, that both should be Bishops toge-

ther, and all should obey him that survived; to this they all agreed, confirming it by Oath. Yet *Flavianus*, one of *Miletus* his disciples, after his death, got himself chosen Bishop, but was in that condemned by all.

It is true, that the *Novatians* in divers Sees had distinct Bishops, but these were Schismaticks. Yet in the beginning of Christianity, it would appear that there were more Bishops in one place: for *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius* assert, that *Clemens* was ordained Bishop of *Rome* by S. *Peter*. And yet all reckon *Linus* to have succeeded him. So also *Evodius* is generally reckoned to be the first Bishop of *Antioch*; thus *Eusebius*, *Origen* and *Jerome*. Yet *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* say, that *Ignatius* was ordained there by S. *Peter*. If there be any authority in *Clemens* his Constitutions, they offer a clear account of this, that *Evodius* was appointed Bishop of the Circumcision, and *Ignatius* Bishop of the Uncircumcision; and that after *Evodius*'s death, both Churches grew in one. The same also is applied to the difference about *Linus*, and *Clemens* by others, as if *Linus* had been Bishop of the Circumcision, and *Clemens* of the Uncircumcision; and that after *Cletus*'s death they all grew in one, and submitted to *Clemens*. However, it is clear that in every Church there was but one Bishop: and accordingly was decreed, *Conc. Nic.*

*Nic.Can.*8. Ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν. By which stile we see they guarded against the disorder of two Bishops in a City, as a thing undoubtedly irregular, which hath been accounted so before that time: so that this of *one Bishop in a City*, is not to be accounted an act of that Council; but a reference to some former act, or at least an universally received practice. Yet the first succession of the Bishops of *Rome*, tho always perplexed, is much more so, from the most learned *Vossius* (his Observations in his Letter to *Rivet*, subjoined to *Doctor Pearson*'s *Vindiciæ of Ignatius his Epistles*:) who from all the Manuscripts of *Damasus* his *lives of the Popes*, informs us, that S. *Peter* did ordain both *Linus* and *Cletus* Bishops of *Rome*: and after some enquiry into the matter, he concludes, that at first there were three Bishops in *Rome* at once, *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Anencletus*. In the next Succession, he places *Cletus*, *Anencletus* and *Clemens*; but *Anencletus* surviving both the other, sate alone at *Rome*: after whom there was but one Bishop there. Yet I know not if *Damasus* ought to have such authority, that upon his testimony we are bound to believe a thing so different from the accounts given by elder and more unquestioned Writers.

All *ambitus* was condemned in Bishops; but it seems that in *Nazianzen*'s time it was too

common: For he in his Apologetick regrates how some πολὺ ἄξιοι νομίζειν σφᾶς εἶναι τῆς ἱερᾶς μεταπίνται τὸ βῆμα, *tanquam non virtutis exemplum, sed victûs parandi occasionem & subsidium hunc ordinem esse judicantes: ac non munus referendis rationibus obnoxium, sed imperium ab omni censurâ immune.* And a little after: *Prius fere quam primam comam abjecerimus, puerilia more balbutire desierimus. — Si duo aut tria pia verba didicerimus, eaque non ex lectione, sed ex sola auditione hausta, aut Davidi paulum operæ dederimus, aut pallium scite contraxerimus, aut zonâ tenus philosophati fuerimus, pietatis quandam speciem nobis illinentes, ô præfecturam! ô elatum animum!* *Justinian. Const. Nov.* 137. *cap.* 1. complains, that *absque examinatione, atq; honestatis vitæ testimonio ordinantur Episcopi, Presbyteri, & Diaconi, &c.* And there divers places out of *Nazianzen*'s Apologetick are cited, to shew that Ordination should be gone about *cum omni diligentiâ atque rigore, Cod. de Epis. & Cler. leg.* 31. *Tantum ab ambitu debet esse sepositus, ut quæratur cogendus, rogatus recedat, invitatus effugiat, sola sibi suffragetur necessitas excusandi. Profectò enim est indignus Sacerdotio, nisi fuerit invitatus, invitus.*

Chrysostom in his third Book *de Sacerdotio, cap.* 10. among the qualifications of a Bishop, reckons for a chief one παντοχόθεν αὐτῷ τῆς τε σώματος ὀπτυμίας κεκαθάρθαι δεῖ τὴν ψυχήν. *Nam*

si

si ad eum principatum adipiscendum vehementi animi affectu rapietur, eo adepto impotentiorem sane suæ ambitionis flammam incendet: ac vi tandem captus, ut sibi adeptum honorem stabiliat, nulli non peccato serviet: seu adulandum, seu servile quidpiam atque indignum sustinendum, seu res magno pecuniæ sumptu tentanda: nam quod nonnulli cædibus Ecclesias compleverint, contaminarintq; tum ejus honoris gratiâ depugnantes, civitates aliquot funditus everterunt dicere hic prætermitto, ne quibusdam videar ea in medium afferre quæ fide majora sunt. And to preoccupy the objection from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. he adds, Ἐγὼ δὲ ὁ ἔργα, τῆς δὲ ἀνδρείας, καὶ δυναστείας ὑπόπτευμεν εἶπον εἶναι δεινόν. And among other advantages of one who wants this too forward desire, he reckons this ἀδὲ τὴν καθαίρεσιν αὐτῆς δέδοικε. And with a great deal of ingenuity, he confesseth how strong that unlawful desire was in himself, which frighted him from entering in holy Orders.

How far *Nazianzen* was from all *ambitus*, the whole tract of his life doth fully discover. He was no sooner ordained a Presbyter, than he with his friend *Basile*, at that time likewise ordained, fled to *Pontus*, where they lived a great while, purifying their souls in the exercise of prayer and mortification. After which they returned home. *Nazianzen* out of compassion to his Father who pressed his return, and *Basile*

out

out of zeal to Religion, and the Church then over-run with *Arrians*; S. *Basile* by the means of old *Nazianzen*, was chosen and ordained Bishop of *Cesarea*, and he ordained *Nazianzen* Bishop of *Sasime*: but he, what through his love of retirement, what because *Sasime* being a stage of the Waggoners, was full of stirs and disorders, immediately left that place, in which he was set against his heart. And some say that he never ordained any in it, nor consecrated the Eucharist while he was there: neither could ever his Father obtain of him to return to it. And when his Father dealt earnestly with him, not without threatning of imprecations, that he would accept the charge of *Nazianzen* in his old age, he with great aversion yielded to his entreaty, declaring he would stay no longer there than his Father lived. During which time, he managed that See with a great deal of success and applause: but after his Father died, which was in the hundred year of his age, he continued a little longer there, till his Mother who survived her Husband sometime, died also. And then he retired to a House of holy Virgins in *Seleucia*, that in his absence they might chuse another Bishop; but returning thither a little after, he found they had chosen none; yet he continued stiff as an Oak, and neither prayers nor tears could prevail with him. Afterward *Constantinople* was

was in great disorder through the Heresies of *Apollinaris* and *Macedonius* lately sprung up, beside the *Arrian*, which was there before: and he being inwardly called of *God* to go thither, and prompted by his Friend *Basile*, and invited by many Bishops, and honourable Citizens, went and laboured among them: not behaving himself as their Bishop, but as a temporary Overseer. And though all the Churches were then possess'd by the Hereticks, none remaining for the Orthodox, save only *Anastasia*; yet through his labours the face of affairs was quickly altered in *Constantinople*. When *Theodosius* came to *Constantinople*, he possessed him of the great Church: and all the people desired that he might be enthroned, the Emperour concurring with them in that: but he declined it: And though the Emperour took great pleasure in him, yet he went seldom to the Palace. Then was the second *General Council* called to *Constantinople*, and he was by the authority of *Miletus* Bishop of *Antioch* (of whom we made mention before) confirmed in the Bishoprick of *Constantinople* by the Council. But after this, there arose some contention by *Timotheus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who came later to the Council, and alledged upon the prerogative of his See, that that matter should not have been decided without him. Upon this, hot and

sharp

sharp contentions arose among the Bishops, not so much out of any displeasure they had at *Nazianzen*, as out of their mutual jealousies, though he that writes his life, saith, that this was occasioned by *Miletus* his death. But therein he was mistaken; for *Miletus* out-lived not only this action, and gave the list to *Theodosius* of those who were designed to succeed him (*Sozom. lib. 7. cap.8.*) but he also out-lived the Council, and subscribed its acts, and died a little after that in *Constantinople*. Upon this contention, *Nazianzen* finding many of those who had before established him, beginning to resile, told them how at first he had refused that Government, tho the Church there had been by his labours and pains setled, and enlarged; but for that he expected his reward from GOD: yet it seemed strange to him, that after he had been forced to accept of it, out of his love to the Flock, and pressed to it with their united suffrages, they should now think of undoing what themselves had done. This he said, not that he desired Riches, or the nobleness of that Seat, and to be called *Bishop of the Imperial City:* But he confessed, the loss of his Children could not but affect him: besides, he feared they might seem to proceed out of envy or lenity. However, if they desired it, ἀλύπως τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐξίσαμαι. — *Mihi quidem solitudo & olim chara fuit & nunc est:*

est: ἐ γὰρ δεῖ εἴρξειν οἱ τὸν θεῖνον ἀποστερήσοντες. Whereupon he went out, and retired from the house wherein he dwelt, to one more secret. But many of the people flocked about him, and with tears besought him to have compassion on them: yet he finding the dissention about him growing hotter among the Bishops, went again to the Council, and charged them by the holy Trinity, that they would compose their differences peaceably, adding: *But if I seem the occasion of any dissention among you, I am not more worthy than the Prophet* Jonas: *throw me in the sea, and these raging billows shall quickly be calmed, since I shall choose any thing you please, so if I be innocent, for drawing you to agreement on my account.* Θεῖνε ἐξώσατε, πόλεως ἀπελάσατε· μόνον τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν εἰρηνὴν ἀγαπήσατε· ἔρρωδε ἱερεῖ ποιμένες. After which he went to the Emperor, and with great earnestness begged his permission to retire: which having obtained, he called the Clergy and people together, and with many tears took leave of them, charging them to continue stedfast in the faith. This being done, he retired to *Arianze*, a Village of *Cappadocia*, which belonged to him by inheritance, and continued in his retirement, giving himself to his Poetry, till he died in an old age.

That which next occurs to be considered is, in what places Bishopricks were founded, and

Bishops

Bishops setled. We find in all Cities where the Gospel was planted, and Churches constituted, that Bishops were also ordained. Among the *Jews*, where ever there were an hundred and twenty of them together, there did they erect a Synagogue. Compare with this *Acts* 1. 15. where the number of those that constituted the first Christian Church, is the same. So it is like where ever there was a competent number of Christians together, that a Church was there setled.

Yet in some Villages there were Churches and Bishops; so there was a Bishop in *Bethany*: And S. *Paul* tells of the Church of *Cenchrea*, which was the port of *Corinth*. It is true, some think that the Church of *Corinth* met there. So these of *Philippi* went out of the City by a River side to prayer, *Acts* 16. 13. But we find *Acts* 18. that there was a Synagogue in *Corinth*, and that S. *Paul* stayed in the House of *Justus*, near the Synagogue: and therefore there is no reason to think that the Christians should have had their meeting without the City, since there was no persecution then stirring: and neither in the *Acts*, nor in any of the *Epistles*, is there mention made of their going out to *Cenchrea*. Therefore it is probable that the Church of *Cenchrea* was distinct from *Corinth*: and since they had *Phebe* for their Deaconness, it is not to be doubted

but

but they had both Bishops and Deacons.

From the several Cities the Gospel was dilated and propagated to the places round about. But in some Countries we find the Bishopricks very thick set. They were pretty throng in *Africk*, for at a Conference which *Augustine* and the Bishops of that Province had with the *Donatists*, there were of Bishops two hundred eighty six present, and one hundred and twenty absent, and sixty Sees were then vacant, which make in all four hundred sixty and six: There were also two hundred seventy nine of the *Donatists* Bishops. *Sozom. lib. 7. hist. cap. 19.* speaking how differently constituted some Churches were, he tells how in *Scythia*, though there were many Cities, yet there was but one Bishop. But in other Nations there were Bishops even in their Villages, as he knew to be among the *Arabians* and *Cyprians*. *Theodoret* tells, that there were eight hundred Parishes within his Diocese, *Epist. 113.* But it is to be observed, that in those places where the Gospel was latest of planting, the Bishopricks are fewer, and consequently larger. It is reported that in the vast tract of the *Abyssin* Churches, there is one only Bishop at *Abuna*. *Balsamon* on the 57. Canon of *Laodicea* tells, that at that time in some Churches of the *East*, it was neither safe nor expedient for them to have Bishops: and they were

sup-

supplied by Visiters, sent them from other Bishops, so that they had no Bishops of their own: which was occasioned both by their poverty, and the smalness of their number, yet they were under the care and charge of other Bishops. Some Churches lay long vacant and without Bishops. In *Carthage*, when *Hunnerick* invaded them, they wanted a Bishop twenty four years: and he offering them one, providing the *Arrians* might have the free exercise of their Religion among them, they answered, that upon these terms *Ecclesia non delectatur Episcopum habere*, so *Victor lib. 2. pers. Vand.* When *Miletus* was driven out of *Antioch*, for ten years together *Diodorus* and *Flavian* two Presbyters ruled that Church, *Theodor. lib. 4. hist. cap. 23.* Some places are alledged to have had the Gospel long before there were Bishops among them, and particularly *Scotland*, for *Major lib. 2. cap. 2.* saith, *per Sacerdotes & Monachos, sine Episcopis Scoti in fide eruditi erant.* The time of our conversion to the faith is reckoned to have been *An. 263.* And *Palladius* reckoned the first Bishop came not for an hundred and seventy years after that in the year 430. *Fordown* in his *Chronicle, lib. 3. cap. 8.* saith, *Ante Palladii adventum habebant Scoti fidei Doctores, & Sacramentorum administratores, Presbyteros solum, vel Monachos ritum sequentes Ecclesiæ primitivæ.*

These

These were called *Culdes*, though in some Bulls they be *Celli Dei*. *Boethius* thinks it is *Culdei*, *quasi cultores Dei*: but others judg that it is from the Cells wherein they lived, which were held in great esteem, and after their death were turned into Churches: and from thence they think the name *Kil* is to this day so much used, as *Kilpatrick*, *Kilmarnock*, *Kilbride*, &c. Of these *Boethius* saith, That by common suffrage, they made choice of one of their number to be chief over them, who was called *Episcopus Scotorum*: so *lib. 6. fol. 92.* This is contradicted by *Buchanan lib. 5.* who saith, That before *Palladius* his coming, *Ecclesiæ absque Episcopis per Monachos regebantur, minori quidem cum fastu, & externâ pompâ, sed majore simplicitate & sanctimoniâ.* But all our old Manuscripts being gone, it will not be easie to come to a decision about this matter. The *Gothick* Churches are said to have been planted and constituted before *Ulphilas* their first Bishop came unto them for seventy years together.

In the beginning the Bishop's whole charge was called παροικία, and by the strain of *Ignatius* his Epistles, especially that to *Smyrna*, it would appear, that there was but one Church, at least but one place, where there was one Altar and Communion in each of these Parishes: for he saith, There was one Bishop, one Church, and

one Altar. And *Cyprian* phraseth the erecting of a Schism, by the erecting of an Altar against an Altar: which seems to import, that there was but one Altar in the Bishops Parish. While the number of the Christians was but small, they might well have all met together in one place; but as they increased, and the persecutions grew upon them, they must have had several meeting places, and consequently several persons to preside and officiate in these meetings. But *Damasus* and *Platina* reckon, that *Evaristus* who was Bishop of *Rome* about the 106. year, was the first, *qui titulos in urbe Româ Presbyteris divisit*: so that before his time, the Presbyters have all officiated here or there indefinitely according to the Bishop's appointment. And *Evaristus* seems to have given them assignments to particular places. As for the meaning of the word *Tituli* it is to be considered that the Christians met about the places where the Martyrs were buried and so their meeting places were called *Memoriæ Martyrum*. Now upon Burials some title or inscription being usually made, it followed that the place of the burial or Gravestone was called *Titulus* among the *Latins*: so *Gen.* 35.20 *Jacob*'s erecting a Pillar upon *Rachels* Grave, is rendred by the vulgar *Latin*, *erexit titulum super sepulchrum*: and *Gen.* 28.18. of *Jacob*'s stone at *Bethel*, it is said, *erexit in titulum*, and 2 *Sam.* 18.

18

18. *Absalom* his Pillar is called *Titulus:* Hence it is that *Evaristus* his dividing of the titles is to be understood of his giving particular assignments of several Churches to Presbyters.

The next thing to be examined is, what were the actions appropriated to Bishops. If we believe *Jerome*, the Bishop did nothing which Presbyters might not do, except Ordination: By which we see, that he judged Ordination could not be done without the Bishop. *Athanasius* in his second *Apology* inserts among other papers, an Epistle of the *Synod* of *Alexandria*, mentioning that *Ischyras* his Ordination by *Coluthus* being questioned and examined, and it being found that *Coluthus* had never been ordained a Bishop, but that he had falsly pretended to that Title and Character, all the Ordinations made by him were annulled: and *Ischyras* with such others who were so ordained, were declared Laicks. Which is an undeniable instance, that at that time, it was the general sense of the Church, that none but a Bishop might ordain. Neither in any Author do we meet with an instance of any that were ordained by Presbyters, save one, that *Cassian*, who was about the 500. year, *Collat.* 4. *cap.* 1. gives of one *Paphnutius* a Presbyter in the Desert of *Scetis*, who delighting in the Vertues of one *Daniel*, *ut quem vitæ meritis & gratiâ sibi parem noverat, coæquare sibi*

etiam Sacerdotii ordine festinaret. — *Eum Presbyterii honori provexit.* But what a few devout solitaries might do in a desert and undiscerned corner, will be no precedent for a constituted Church: else we may allow of Baptism with sand, for that was once done in a Desert.

But *Socrates* had another Opinion of this, who *lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. tells, that *Ischyras* did a thing πολλῶν θανατῶν ἄξιον, οὐδὲ πώποτε γὰρ ἱερεσύνης τυχὼν τὸ τῦ πρεσβυτέρυ ὄνομα ἑαυτῷ περιθέμενος. And in the third Council of *Toledo*, set down by *Gratian*, *dist.* 23. *cap.* 14. this Canon was made. *Quorundam Clericorum dum unus ad Presbyterium duo ad Levitarum ministerium sacrarentur, Episcopus oculorum dolore detentus, fertur manum suam super eos tantum imposuisse, & Presbyter quidam illis contra Ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse, sed quia jam ille examini divino relictus, humano judicio accusari non potest, ii qui supersunt gradum Sacerdotii vel Levitici ordinis quem perverse adepti sunt, amittant.* By which we see how far they were from allowing of any Ordination, wherein a Bishop had not intervened.

It is further clear, that the Bishop was looked upon as the Pastor of the Flock, who was πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τῦ κυρίυ, and that Presbyter or Deacons could finish nothing, ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπυ, and that he was to give an account of the Souls of the people: and indeed in these

day

days a Bishoprick was *onus* more than *honos*. The common treasury of the Church was also committed to his care, so *infra Can.* 4. And as the Offerings of the faithful were laid down at the Apostles feet, *Acts* 4.34. so were the *collectæ*, and the other goods of the Church laid in their hands. For all the goods of the Church and *collectæ*, were at first deposited in the Bishop's hand, and distributed by him, tho afterwards there was an *Œconomus* appointed for that work.

Ignatius Epist. ad Magnes. tells, that they were to do nothing without their Bishop. And *ad Smyrn.* μηδεὶς χωρὶς ὁπισκόπε τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. And 5. Canon of *Laodicea*, they might no nothing, ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπε. *Idem. Can.*19. *Arel.* 1.

As for Baptism, *Tertull. de bapt.* saith, *Dandi quidem jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui & Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non quidem sine Episcopi authoritate, propter Ecclesiæ bonum, quo salvo salva pax est, alioquin laicis etiam jus est. Firmilian ad Cyprianum*, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprian* his *Epistles*, saith, *Majores natu* (and by what is a little after, where he calls these Bishops, it is clear he means not of Presbyters) *in Ecclesiâ præsidebant, & baptizandi, & manum imponendi, & ordinandi, potestatem possidebant. Pacian. serm. de Bapt. Lavacro peccata*

purgantur, Chrismate spiritus super funditur, utraq; vero ista manu & ore Antistitis impetramus. And even *Jerome* himself *contra Luciferianos*, saith, *Sine Chrismate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus habent baptizandi.* By all which we see, that Baptism was chiefly the Bishop's work, and that the Presbyters did not baptize without his order.

As for the Eucharist, *Ignatius ad Smyrnenses*, saith, ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ And a little after οὐκ ἔξον ἐστὶν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν. *Justin* in his second *Apol.* giving the account of their Eucharist and whole service, reckons all to have been managed by the προεστὼς. And *Tert. de cor. mil. Non de aliorum quam præsidentium manibus sumimus.* But all this is very unjustly applied by such as would pretend to the whole Ecclesiastical Authority; but would exempt themselves from the great labor of it. For it is clear, that according to the primitive constitution, the Bishop was the immediate Pastor of the flock, and the Presbyters were assumed by him *in partem sollicitudinis:* the greatest of the load still lying on his own shoulders, and this might have been some way managed by him, where the Dioceses were smaller. But the enlarging of the Dioceses hath wholly altered the figure of Primitive Episcopacy. All that the Bishop

shop can now do being to try entrants well, and oversee these that are in charge; which ought not to be performed either by these overly visitations in Synods, or by a pompous procession through the Diocese, but by a strict and severe Examen both of their lives and labors, performed in such visitations, as are sutable to the simplicity and humility of the Gospel.

As for Preaching, it was ordinary at first, even for persons not ordained to preach, not to mention that of the *Corinthians*, where *every one brought his Psalm, his interpretation, or his doctrine to the Meeting*, which may be called Extraordinary; under which notion, most reject every thing in Scripture that doth not please them. But this continued longer in the Church. *Euseb. lib.* 6. *hist. cap.* 20. tells, that *Origen* before he had gotten the χειροτονίαν τῦ πρεσβυτερίε (mark how this word stands here for the order and degree of Presbyterat) was invited earnestly by the Bishops not only to dispute, but also to expound the Scriptures, ἐν τῆ τῦ κοινῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας *In the publick assembly of the Church.* For the vindication whereof *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Theoctistus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, wrote to *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria* thus: *Quod autem in literis adjunxeris nunquam antea auditum, neque jam usurpatum, ut Laici præsentibus Episcopis disputarent, scripturásve exponerent in eo mihi, nescio quo modo, videris*

videris falsa dixisse: Nam ubi idonei & habiles reperiuntur, qui fratribus in verbo DEI adjumento sint, à sanctis Episcopis rogantur, ut populum DEI instituant in verbo, sicut Larandis Euelpis à Neone, Iconii Paulinus à Celso, & apud Synadas Theodorus ab Attico, qui omnes beati ac pii fratres erant: ac verisimile est, quamvis nobis obscurum & minime cognitum sit, illud idem in aliis locis fieri. Tert. in his *Apologetick cap.*39. tells, that *Post aquam manualem & lumina, quisquis ut de Scripturis sanctis, vel de proprio ingenio potest provocatur in medium DEO hymnum canere.* And of this remember what was before cited from *Hilary* the Deacon on the 4th of the *Ephesians. Sozom. lib.*7. *cap.* 19. saith, that at *Rome* neither the Bishop, nor any other taught in the Church: but that in *Alexandria* the Bishop alone taught, that not being allowed to any Presbyter, after *Arrius* broached his Heresie.

It remains only to be enquired who was the proper Minister of Confirmation. But because this whole matter of Confirmation comes not in so properly upon any of the other Canons, I shall therefore examine all that relates to it here, and shall consider upon what grounds it was used, how early it was practiced, with what Rites it was administred, who was the proper Minister of it, and for what end it was introduced, and continued in the Church.

From

From *Acts* 8. 15. and 19. 6. all the Fathers have pleaded for this Rite: for there we have the laying on of hands practiced, as a Rite clearly distinct from Baptism: and tho we find the holy Ghost conferred by that imposition of hands, thence it will not follow that that action was extraordinary, and so to have expired with the Apostles: For we find extraordinary effects following upon their ordinary actions, such as Ordination, Excommunication, *&c.* And yet none will plead that these actions are now to be disused, because they are no more attended with such effects. But *Heb.* 6. 2. speaks most plainly for this, where among the foundations of Religion, the laying on of hands is joined with Baptisms: and this seemed so clear to *Calvin* commenting on that place, that he judges this to have been a Rite derived from the Apostles.

The constant Ceremony of it was that which is often mentioned in Scripture, *Imposition of hands*. But besides this, they began very early to use a *Chrisma* of consecrated Oil, with which they anointed them in the brow. This it seems hath been taken from the mention that we find made of anointing, 2 *Cor.* 1. 21. where some think the whole Rites of Confirmation are set down in these words: *Now he which stablisheth us with you in* CHRIST, *and hath anointed us, is*

GOD

GOD, who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. And 1 *Joh.*2.27. we are told of *an unction from above*, and *a holy anointing*. But that in these words no material anointing, but the extraordinary conferring of the holy Ghost is meant, seems clear from the Text: and so *Christ* is said to be *anointed with the Oil of joy above his fellows*, tho we hear nothing of a material anointing. It is true, *James* 5. 14. there is clear mention made of an anointing with Oil, in which certainly there is no Metaphor, but that relates nothing to our purpose. However, it is like from these places it was that the Ancients used the *Chrisma*, for we find that this was very early practised in the Church.

Theophilus Alexandrinus, who flourished about the year 170. *lib.*1. *ad Antolycum*, saith, we are for this reason called *Christians*, ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον τοῦ θεοῦ. *Et quis mortalium est, qui vel ingreditur in hanc vitam, vel certat in arenâ & non oleo inungitur.* *Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.*18. tells, That *Valentinus* used both *Confirmation and anointing in the receiving of his Disciples*, and tells, that *he used a mixture of Water and Oil with Opobalsamum.* And this seems to imply that to have been the practice of the Church; for he tells, that *Valentinus* had adapted and transformed the Rites of the Church into his Character. *Tert. de bapt. cap.* 7. makes mention of the *Unctio benedicta*,

qua

qua egressi de lavacro perunguntur. And *cap.*8. *dehinc manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & invitans Spiritum Sanctum, Idem de resur. carnis, cap.*8. saith, *Caro abluitur —— caro ungitur — caro signatur, caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut & anima spiritu illuminetur.* And *lib. de præscript. cap.*36. *Aquâ signat, Spiritu sancto vestit, Eucharistiâ pascit.* Yet *Tert. de Cor. Mil. cap.* 3. when he recounts these Ceremonies which he judged to have been of Apostolical tradition, doth not reckon this for one.

*Cyprian Epist.*73. *ad Jubaianum,* speaking of S. *Peter* and S. *John* their laying on of hands at *Samaria,* shews it was no new Baptism: *Sed tantummodo quod deerat id à Petro & Joanne factum esse, ut oratione pro iis habitâ, ac manu impositâ, invocaretur & infunderetur super eos Spiritus sanctus: quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram orationem & manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, & signaculo divino consummentur.* And *Epist.*70. after he hath spoken of Baptism, he adds, *Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus sit, ut accepto Chrismate id est unctione esse unctus Dei, & habere in se gratiam Christi possit.* And he tell, That both the Eucharist & *oleum unde unguntur babtizati, in altari sanctificatur. Cyril* of *Jerusalem* his third *Mistagogical Catechism* is, περὶ χρίσματος, wherein he describes

the

the anointing we have from *GOD*; and the consecrated Oil, which was the rite expressive of the former, comparing it to the Dove that descended from *Christ*, and was his spiritual Anointing. Which is also done by *Optatus*, *lib.*4. *cont. Parmenianum*, and the *Areopagite de Eccles. hier. cap.*4. where he at length describes the rites used in the consecrating of the *Chrisma*. Yet this *Chrisma* was not so peculiar to Confirmation, but that it was also used upon other occasions. *Nazianzen* tells (as is above cited) that such as were ordained, were also anointed. It was also used in Baptism, so both *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Jerome*, and the 48. *Canon* of the Council of *Laodicea* decrees, that the *Illuminati post baptisma* should be anointed with this *unguentum cœleste*. But by the 1. *Can.* of the Council of *Orange*, it was decreed, *That he who was not anointed at Baptism, should receive the Chrisma at his Confirmation:* by which it seems they did not repeat the ceremony of Anointing, to such as had received it at Baptism.

Likewise these who returned from Heresie, by the 7. *Can.* of the second *General Council* were to be anointed *& fronte, & oculis, & naribus, & ore, & auribus, & signantes eos dicimus donum Spiritus sancti.* And like unto this is the 7. *Can.* of *Laodicea*. And *Author Resp. ad Orthod.* that goeth under *Justin*'s name, *ad quæst.*14. *Cum hæreticus*

eticus ad veram fidem accedit, corrigitur lapsus falsæ opinionis, sententiæ mutatione: baptismi, sancti Chrismatis unctione; ordinationis, manum impositione: nihilque quod prius erat, indissolutum manet. Now by this χειροθεσία, which he mentions, is not meant a new Ordination, which was not given to these that returned from Heresie. For as appears by the Council of *Nice*, the Orders which they got among the Hereticks were held valid, and not to be renewed: but this is meant of the Ceremony ordinarily given in the absolution and receiving of Penitents. *August. cont. Donatist. lib.5. cap.* 23. confesseth, that the Baptism of Hereticks was valid, but denies that they conferred the holy Ghost, and therefore imposition of hands was given to those who returned from Heresie.

Besides this *Chrisma*, they used also in Confirmation the sign of the Cross, of which that phrase of *Tertullian* is to be understood *caro signatur.* And *Aug. in Psal.* 141. speaking of the Sacraments, saith, *Quædam sicut nostri ore accipimus, quædam per totum corpus.* And a little after, *tegat frontem crux Domini*, which words are to be understood of the Eucharist, Baptism and Confirmation. He calls this also *Sacramentum Chrismatis, lib.2. cont. Petilianum, cap.* 104. applying to it that of the Ointment on *Aaron*'s beard, *Psalm* 133. But elsewhere he calls that Bread

which

which was bleſt, not with the Euchariſtical and Sacramental benediction, but with that lower degree, called *Eulogy*, which might be given to the Catechumens, *Sacramentum Catechumenorum*; uſing this term largely, as he ſaith *Epiſt. ad Marcellinum. Signum cum ad rem ſacram applicatur, Sacramentum appellatur.* Of this ſign of the Croſs, is likewiſe to be underſtood that of the *Signaculum Dominicum*, mentioned by *Cyprian, Ep.* 73.

The next thing to be enquired after is, who was the Miniſter of Confirmation? In the *Weſtern* Church the Biſhop did only adminiſter it. So *Jerome adv. Luciferianos*, brings in the Luciferian in the Dialogue. *An neſcis Eccleſiarum hunc morem eſſe, ut baptizatis poſtea manus imponantur, & ita invocetur Spiritus ſanctus? Exigis ubi ſcriptum eſt? In Actibus Apoſtolorum. Etiamſi Scripturæ authoritas non ſubeſſet, totius orbis hanc in partem conſenſus, inſtar præcepti obtineret.* Then he makes the Orthodox to anſwer: *Non equidem abnuo hanc eſſe Eccleſiarum conſuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati ſunt, Epiſcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus excurrat.* And asking why the holy Ghoſt was not given, but by the Biſhop? He anſwers, That was *potius ad honorem Sacerdotii, quam ad legis neceſſitatem. Aug. de Trin. lib.* 15. *cap.* 16. ſpeaking of the Apoſtles conferring of the holy Ghoſt, ſaith, *Orabant, ut veniret Spiritus ſanctus*

tus in eos quibus manum imponebant, non enim ipsi eum dabant, quem morem in suis præpositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia.

But in the *Greek* Church, Presbyters might confirm: so the above cited *Hilary* on the 4. of the *Ephes. Deniq; apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignant, ubi præsens non sit Episcopus:* and *lib. quæst. in Vet. & Nov. Test.* called *Augustin's*, but believed to be the same *Hilary's*, *quæst.* 101. saith, *In Alexandriâ, & per totam Ægyptum si desit Episcopus consecrat Presbyter.* By the comparing of which places, it appears, that it is the same thing which is expresst by these various names of *Consecration* and *Consignation*: but what is meant by it, is not agreed to. It is absurd to think that Ordination can be meant by it. For that decision of the case of *Ischyras* shews that in *Alexandria* they were far from allowing Presbyters to ordain without a Bishop. Some think that because *Consecration* is more usually applied to the blessing of the Eucharist; therefore both it and *Consignation*, is so to be understood here. And whereas it is objected that in the cited places some custom peculiar to *Alexandria* seems to be mentioned; but it was universally allowed in the Bishop's absence for the Presbyter to consecrate the Eucharist: therefore some other thing must be there meant. It is answered to this, that in other places Presbyters might not consecrate *sine Episcopi jussione*; accord-

ing

ing to what was cited out of *Ignatius*; and that the custom in *Alexandria* hath been, that the Presbyters without any such expres's Mandate, might have consecrated in the Bishop's absence. But the general practice of the *Greek* Church inclines me to think, that *Confirmation* is meant by the cited places, which was usually phrased by *Consignation* σφραγὶς, or σφράγισμος, only the consecrating af the *Chrisma* and Oil, was peculiar to the Bishop, as his work; so that the *Greeks* seem to have made a difference betwixt the hallowing and applying of the *Chrisma*. The first could only be done by the Bishop, but the second was not denied to the Presbyters. Even as in the Eucharist none might consecrate but Presbyters,, yet Laicks of both Sexes, in case of necessity, might have carried and given it to the absents.

Of Confirmation administred by Presbyters, some instances do meet us in the *Latin* Church. The first Canon of the Council of *Orange*, permits the use of the *Chrisma* to the Priests, who are appointed to carry some of it always about with them. *Conc. Epaunense, cap.* 16. permits the Presbyters to give the *Chrisma* to such Hereticks as were converted on their death-beds. And the second Canon of the Council of *Orange* is: *Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderant, si Episcopus desit, à Presbyteris cum Chrismate & benedictione consignari placuit.* And

the

he Council of *Toledo* permits a Presbyter to do
t in the Bishops absence, or in his presence, if
commanded by him. But both *East* and *West*, it
vas agreed, that the *Chrisma* could not be san-
tified by Presbyters. *Conc. Romanum sub Sylv.*
ap. 5. decreed it. But as that Council is much
uspected, so the reason there given is a very
oor one. *Quia Christus dicitur à Chrismate.* But
Canon sixth, *Cod. Afric.* is more authentick, *ut*
Chrisma à Presbyteris non fiat. And Synod *Tolet.*
Can. 20. *Quamvis pene ubique custodiatur ut absq;*
Episcopo nemo Chrisma conficiat, tamen quia in ali-
quibus locis vel Provinciis dicuntur Presbyteri Chri-
sma conficere, placuit ex hoc die nullum alium nisi
Episcopum hoc facere. And the *Areopagite*, as he
t length describes it, and descants upon it, so
ie appropriates it to the Bishop.

Gregory the Great, lib. 3. *Epist.* 9. writing to *Ja-*
uarius Bishop of *Caralis* in *Sardinia*, discharges
Presbyters to anoint with the *Chrisma* on the
row, appointing that to be reserved to the
Bishop: for *Sardinia*, and the other Isles, had
bserved the customs of the *Greek* Church: but
Gregory Epist. 26. writing to that same person,
ells, that he heard how some were scandalized,
ecause he had discharged Presbyters the use of
he *Chrisma*, which he therefore takes off in
hese words: *Et nos quidem secundum usum vete-*
em Ecclesiæ nostræ fecimus, sed si omnino hac de re

aliqui contristantur, ubi Episcopi desunt, ut Presbyteri etiam in frontibus baptizatos Chrismate tangere debeant concedimus.

But 200 years afterwards, *Nicolaus* first Bishop of *Rome*, observed not that moderation For the *Bulgarians* who were converted by the *Greeks*, receiving the *Chrisma* from the Presbyters according to the custom of that Church *Nicolaus* sent Bishops to them, and appointed such as had been confirmed by Presbyters to be confirmed again by Bishops. But upon this, *Photius*, who was then Patriarch of *Constantinople* called a *Synod*, it which it was decreed, that the *Chrisma* being hallowed by a Bishop, might be administred by Presbyters. And *Photius* in his Epistle contends, that a Presbyter might, *unguento signare, sanctificare, consummatos augere, & expiatorium donum baptizato consummare*, as well as he might either baptize or offer at the Altar. But *Nicolaus* impudently denied, that this had ever been permitted, and upon this account it is that many of the *Latins* have charged the *Greek* Church, as if there were no Confirmation used among them. But this challenge is denied and rejected by the *Greeks*. And so much of the Minister of Confirmation.

It is in the last place to be considered, what value was set upon this action, and for what end it was practised in the Church. We have already

d

dy heard *Augustin* call it a *Sacrament*. It is likewise so termed by *Cyprian Epist.* 72. and in the Records of the Council held by him for the rebaptizing of Hereticks. But as was marked before, they took that term largely for an holy rite or symbolical action: Whereas a Sacrament strictly taken is a holy rite instituted by *Christ* for a federal stipulation, by which the promises of the Gospel are sealed, and grace conveyed to the worthy receivers. Now in this sense it is visible, that Confirmation is no Sacrament: it neither being instituted by Christ, nor having any grace appended to it. Neither is it so totally distinct from Baptism, being but a renovation of the baptismal Vow, joined with Prayer, and a solemn benediction.

Some have thought, that Confirmation was only used by the Ancients, as an appendix, or a consummatory rite of Baptism, which mistake is founded upon this, that some of the riper age being baptized, got this imposition of hands after Baptism. For the clearing of which some things must be considered: First, The Ancients used an imposition of hands before Baptism, to such as were admitted to be *Catechumens*, who were in the Christian Church, like the *Proselytes* of the gates among the *Jews*: for they having renounced Idolatry, were admitted to some parts of the Christian worship, and instru-

cted in the faith for some time, before they could commence Christians. And an imposition of hands was used, when any were admitted to this Order: so it is expres's in the 39. Canon of *Elib.* and in the *Greek Euchology* there is a prayer εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸν κατηχούμενον. Where it is said, *Inflat signat & manum imponit.* And in the Liturgy called S. *Marks*, *Quotquot ad Baptismum dispositi estis accedite, ac manus impositionem & benedictionem accipite, dein manum imponit Sacerdos.* And *Euseb. de vita Const. lib.* 4. saith of *Constantine*; *Confessione factâ precum particeps factus est per impositionem manuum.* The *Areopagite* makes mention also of this as done twice before Baptism; and *Aug. de mer. & remis. pec. lib.*2.*cap.*26 *Catechumenum secundum quendam modum suum per signum & orationem manuum impositionis putat sanctificari.* And *Cyprian ad Steph.* makes Baptism a superaddition to that imposition of hands which he draws from the example of *Cornelius* upon whom the Spirit falling first, he was afterward baptized. It is true, he is there speaking of such as turned from Heresie, who he judged should be rebaptized, after an imposition of hands first given them.

But as the 39. Canon of *Elib.* speaks of an imposition of hands given before Baptism, so the 7. Canon of that same Council, mentions another given after it. *Si quis Diaconus regens plebem*

sin

sine Episcopo, vel Presbyteris, aliquos baptizaverit, eos per benedictionem perficere debebit. And by the 33. Canon of that Council, any Laick that was baptized, and was no *Bigamus*, might baptize a *Catechumen* if sick. *Ita ut si supervixerit, ad Episcopum cum perducat, ut per manus impositionem perficere* (or as others read it *perfici*) *possit.* If the first be the reading, it will relate to Confirmation; if the second, it will relate to the compleating of the Baptism.

The 48. Canon of *Laodicea* is, *Illuminatos post baptisma unguento cœlesti liniendos esse.* To infer from that, that Confirmation was immediately to follow upon Baptism is, λειτολογεῖν, for μετὰ τὸ βαπτίσμα, doth not imply that it was to be done immediately after, but only that Baptism was to go before it: and we find that same phrase in the Canons immediately preceding this, applied to such as had been of a great while baptized. But tho such as were of riper years had been confirmed immediately after they received Baptism, it will no more prove that Confirmation was an appendix of Baptism, than that the Eucharist was so likewise, which was also given to them at the same time. So the *Areopagite* tells, how such as were baptized, were carried by the Priest to the Bishop. *Ille vero unguento consecrato virum ungens sacrosanctæ Eucharistiæ participem esse pronunciat.* And tho

even Children were confirmed immediately after Baptism, that doth not prove the one but a rite of the other: for we find that not only in the *African* Churches, but also in the *Roman* Church, the custom of giving Children the Eucharist immediately after Baptism, continued long: for the *Ordo Romanus*, held by some a work of the eleventh Century, appoints, that Children be permitted to eat nothing after they are baptized, till they received the Eucharist. That same practice is also mentioned by *Hugo* the *S. Victore*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 20. in the twelfth Century. And all the *Greek* Writers assert the necessity of Childrens receiving the Eucharist, and yet none asserted the Eucharist to be but a rite of Baptism. *Cornelius* tells of *Novatian* (*apud Eusebium*, *lib.* 6. *hist. cap.* 35.) how he was baptized *Clinicus*, and being recovered *nec reliquorum particeps factus, quæ secundum Canones Ecclesiæ obtinere debuerat, nec ab Episcopo obsignatus est.* (It is true, it is in the *Greek* τῦτε σφραγισθῆναι, as if it were explicative of the τὰ λοίπα, which in the former words he said he wanted; whence some infer, that Confirmation was but one of the Baptismal rites. But it is clear that the true reading is ὕστε, and so *Nicephorus* hath read it) *quo non impetrato, quomodo Spiritum sanctum obtinuisse putandus est.* Yet from the Story it appears that Confirmation was judged only necessary

ad

ad bene esse, and not to the *esse* of a Christian; since notwithstanding the want of this, *Fabian* Bishop of *Rome* ordained *Novatian* a Presbyter.

The *Greek Euchology* shews, that such as were baptized, were after their baptism anointed, and so to be confirmed: and it subjoyning that the Eucharist was to be given to them, proves no more the one to be a rite of Baptism than the other.

The whole current of the Fathers runs, that in Confirmation the holy Ghost was conferred. *August. de Bapt. cont. Donatistas, lib. 3. cap. 16. Spiritus sanctus in solâ Catholicâ, per manus impositionem dari dicitur*, which he derives from the Apostles, tho these extraordinary effects of speaking of Tongues, or the like, did not follow upon it: *Sed invisibiliter & latenter per vinculum pacis, est eorum cordibus charitas divina inspirata.* And concludes, *Quid enim est aliud nisi oratio super hominem.*

And certainly, were Confirmation restored according to the Apostolical practice, and managed with a primitive sincerity, nothing should give more probable hopes of a recovery of the Christian Church, out of the darkness and deadness in which it hath continued so long. It might quicken persons more seriously to consider to what they were engaged in Baptism, when they were put to so solemn a renovation of it. But

the more denuded it were of all unnecessary rites, such as Oil, and the like, it might be more sutable to the Evangelical Spirit. And we see likewise from Antiquity, that there is no reason for appropriating this action wholly, or only to the Bishop. It should not be gone about till the person were ripe in years, and not only able by rote to recite a Catechism, but of a fitness to receive the Eucharist immediately after. But I shall conclude this whole matter with *Calvin*'s words, *lib.* 4. *Instit. cap.* 19. *sect.*4. *& sequentibus:* where after he hath laid out the primitive practice of Confirmation, he subjoins: *Hæc disciplina, si hodie valeret, profecto parentum quorundam ignavia acueretur, qui liberorum institutionem, quasi rem nihil ad se pertinentem, negligunt; quam tum sine publico dedecore omittere non possent. Major esset in populo Christiano fidei consensus, nec tanta multorum inscitia, & ruditas, non adeo temere quidam novis, & peregrinis dogmatibus, abriperentur; omnibus denique esset quædam velut methodus doctrinæ Christianæ.*

A SUPPLEMENT ABOUT THE RURAL BISHOPS, CALLED *CHOREPISCOPI.*

IT hath been already marked, that the extent of the Dioceſes was not all of one proportion; and generally the Villages which lay adjacent to Cities, having received the Goſpel at firſt from them, continued in ſubjection to the City, as to their Mother Church: whereby the Biſhops Pariſh was not limited to the City, but did alſo include the adjacent Villages. The inſcription of *Clemens* his Epiſtles inſinuates this: Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην. Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. By which we ſee, that the Churches of *Rome* and *Corinth* were made up not onely of ſuch as inhabited the Towns, but alſo of ſuch as dwelt about them: and this is yet clearer from *Ignatius* his inſcription of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; ἐκκλησία ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίς Ῥωμαίων. Neither did they judg it fit to ordain Biſhops in ſmaller or leſſer Cities, as appears by the Council of *Sardis*, Can. 6. where it is decreed, that a Biſhop ſhould

should not be ordained ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βεφχείᾳ πόλεως ἢ τινὶ, ᾗ εἷς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ. Adding, that it was not necessary that Bishops should be ordained there, lest the name and dignity of a Bishop should be vilipended.

But before this, it was decreed in the Council of *Laodicea*, Can. 57. ὅτι δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, ᾗ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους ἀλλὰ, (for so reads the Manuscript of *Oxford*, *Dionysius Exiguus*, *Isidore Mercator*, *Hervetus*, and *Fustellus*; and not ἤ, *vel*, as *Binius*) περιοδευτὰς: who were to do nothing without the knowledg of the Bishop of the City, whom the learned *Beverigius* observes (on this Canon) to have been distinct from the Rural Bishops; which he makes out both from the Civil Law, and a place of *Gennadius*, where the Orders of Churchmen being reckoned, these circular Visitors are set in a middle rank betwixt the Rural Bishops and Presbyters. Frequent mention is also made of these Visitors in the Acts of the Council at *Chalcedon*. This course therefore they took for these Villages to send Presbyters from the City, who were called πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιχώριοι: and because the Bishop could not immediately over-see them himself, he did therefore substitute a Vicar and Delegate who was generally called χωρεπίσκοπος. The first time that we meet with any of these, is in the beginning of the fourth Century,

in

in the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Neocesarea*, and *Antiochia*. These differed from Presbyters, in that they got an Ordination distinct from theirs, called by the Council of *Antioch* ἡ χειροτονία τῶν ἐπισκόπων. They also might have ordained *Subdeacons*, *Lectors*, and *Exorcists*, and given them commendatory Letters. But they differed from Bishops in these things: First, that they were ordained but by one Bishop, as appears by the tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τὸ τῆς πόλεως ἢ ὑπόκειται ἐπισκόπε. And therefore it is true that *Balsamon* calls them, τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐξαρχοί. Now we have already seen, that a Bishop must be ordained by two Bishops at least. Next, these χωρεπίσκοποι were ordained μὴ ἔχοντες καθεδρικὰς οἰκίας, saith *Zonaras*. And therefore in their subscriptions of the Councils, they only design themselves *Chorepiscopi*, without mentioning the place where they served, as the Bishops do. Now Bishops could not be ordained but with a Title to a particular charge and See. Thirdly, their power was limited, and in many things inferior to the power of Bishops. So Pope *Leo* the first, in his 88. *Epist. Quamvis, cum Episcopis plurima illis ministeriorum communis sit dispensatio, quædam tamen Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita norint, sicut Presbyterorum & Diaconorum consecratio.* They might in general do nothing ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισ-

ἐπισκόπε, and both the Council of *Ancyra*, Canon 13. And that of *Antioch*, Canon 10. discharge them the ordaining of Presbyters or Deacons. The words of the Council of *Antioch* are δίχα τῦ ἐπισκόπε, which words clearly import, that the Bishop must have intervened in the Ordination, and so are wrong rendered by an old *Latin* Edition, *præter conscientiam Episcopi.* As if they had been only limited not to ordain unless the Bishop gave warrant. And thus these Bishops of the Villages and lesser Cities were reduced from the degree of Bishops, to an inferiour and limited Office, and were undoubtedly of the Episcopal Order, tho their authority was much abridged.

In the Council of *Neocesarea* their relation to the Bishop, is compared to that of the seventy Disciples to the Apostles, and they are called Συλλειτέργοι. And that which is there marked as their chief work, is their care of the poor. But by the Canon of *Antioch*, they might have ordained *Lectors*, *Sub-Deacons*, and *Exorcists*. And yet *Basil* in his 181. *Epist.* saith, That they might not have ordained, even these inferiour ranks, without having first advertised the Bishop, and sent their testimonies, and the suffrages of their Election to him: which is observed by *Aristenus* in his Gloss on the 13. Canon of *Ancyra*: and by *Mattheus Blastares* in his *Syntagma, cap.* 31.

But

But *Damasus*, who was about the year 370. writes his whole fourth *Epistle* against them, telling that he found it decreed by his Predecessors, that they should be abolished, *Prohibiti tam ab hac sacrâ sede, quam à totius orbis Episcopis. — Nam (ut nobis relatum est) quidam Episcoporum, propter suam quietem, eis plebes suas committere non formidant.* And falls severely on these Bishops, and compares them to Mercenaries and Whores, that give out their Children to others to suckle. He proves they were not Bishops, because not ordained by three Bishops, and descants upon the Canons of *Neocesarea* and *Antioch*, which seem to import, as if they had the Ordination of Bishops; adding, *Cesset ergo, cesset tot vicibus damnata præsumptio.* And yet Pope *Leo* (as we have already cited) who was Bishop of *Rome* about 70. years after him, makes mention of them. And notwithstanding all he saith against them, of their being condemned, it doth not appear when or where it was so done. Express mention is made of them in the Council of *Nice*, Canon 8. as of a rank distinct from Presbyters. It being there provided, that such καθαροί, as returned to the unity of the Church, should continue in that same Order of the Clergy, wherein they were before, only such of them as were Bishops might not continue Bishops of a City, where there was already a Bi-

shop

shop placed: because there could not be two Bishops in one City: but if it pleased the Bishop, they might either retain the bare name of a Bishop, or be made *Chorepiscopi*, or continue among the Presbyters.

Mention also is made of them in the 2. Canon of the general Council of *Chalcedon*, which shews, that at that time they were not wholly taken away: but the latest accounts we have of them is in *France*, where it seems they continued longest. *Conc. Paris. An.* 829. they are *cap.* 27. compared to the 70 Disciples, according to that of *Neocesarea*, and Bishops are appointed to see that they did nothing beyond what was permitted to them by the Canons. The like is decreed *Conc. Meldensi*, *An.* 845. *cap.* 44. And it is expressed there, that they might neither give the holy *Chrisma*, nor the holy Ghost, nor confer any Order above that of a Subdeacon, nor consecrate Churches. *Conc. Metensi, Anno* 888. *cap.* 5. It was decreed, That Churches consecrated by them were to be again consecrated by a Bishop, and any thing they did which was proper to a Bishop was declared null, and they are reckoned all one with Presbyters; and here we lose sight of them, hearing no more of them: for as they arose insensibly, so they vanished in the like fashion. So much of them and upon the first Canon.

THE

The SECOND CANON.

Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω καὶ διάκονος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί.

A Presbyter shall be ordained by one Bishop, so likewise a Deacon, and the rest of the Clergy.

WE find most of the Fathers, even *Jerome* himself, drawing the subordination among Churchmen from what was under the Law; and therefore Deacons were ordinarily called *Levites*. But there is more ground to think, it was immediately taken from the form of the Synagogue, tho that constitution might have had its rise from the model of the Temple-service. I shall not here engage in a large Examen of the first Origine and rise of the Synagogues, or of the worship performed in them, or debate whether they began before

fore the Captivity, in it, or after it. Nor what ground there may be from the word *Synagogue* used *Psalm* 74.8. to assert their early date. But certain it is, that the Temple-worship was merely typical, in which the whole people were to assist, but at a few returns of the year. And beside this, the Law of Nature dictates, that *GOD* is to be frequently and solemnly worshipped by such as acknowledge his great Name, which will plead for an early rise to these Assemblies.

But be in that what may be, two things are certain. The one is, that Synagogues were constitute in our Saviour's time, and that there were Rulers, and chief Rulers in these Synagogues, that in them Prayers were said, the Law was read, expounded, and exhortations made upon it, and Discipline was used, and such as were faulty were cast out of these Synagogues. All this is evident from the New Testament: and much more than this can be gathered out of *Jewish* writings. Now our Saviour's going into these Synagogues, reading the Law, and preaching in them, doth abundantly evince, that this constitution was not unlawful.

Another thing is as clear from the Old Testament, that there was neither written command, nor warrant for such Assemblies; and the contrary of this none can undertake to make out.

From

From which positions, both of them equally clear and certain, a great step might be made for the calming and composing of debates about Government, were heats and prejudices out of the way. It being apparent, that there was an entire frame of Church-Government, and worship among the *Jews*, which was not unlawful, though not of divine Institution.

In the Synagogues there was (as is marked before) first, one that was called the *Bishop of the Congregation*. Next, the three Orderers, and Judges of every thing about the Synagogue, who were called *Tsekenim*, and by the *Greeks* πρεσβύτεροι, or γέροντες. These ordered and determined every thing that concerned the Synagogues, or the persons in it. Next them, were the three *Parnassin* or *Deacons*, whose charge was to gather the collections of the Rich, and to distribute them to the poor: And these were called *Septem viri boni Civitatis*. The term *Elder*, was generally given to all their Judges: but chiefly to these of the great *Sanhedrin*, so we have it, *Matth.* 16. 21. *Mark* 8. 31. 14. 43. and 15. 1. And *Acts* 23. 14. And for a fuller satisfaction to this, I must refer you to such as have given an account of the Synagogue out of the *Jewish* Writers.

Next, a great deal might be said, to prove that the Apostles in their first constitutions, took

things as they had them modelled to their hand in the Synagogue: and this they did, both because it was not their design to innovate, except where the nature of the Gospel Dispensation obliged them to it. As also, because they took all means possible to gain the *Jews*, who we find were zealous adherers to the traditions of their Fathers, and not easily weaned from these precepts of *Moses*, which by *Christ*'s Death were evacuated: And if the Apostles went so great a length in complying with them in greater matters, as Circumcision, and other legal observances, (which appears from the *Acts* and *Epistles*) we have good grounds to suppose, that they would have yielded to them in what was more innocent and less important. Besides, there appears both in our *Lord* himself, and in his Apostles, a great inclination to symbolize with them, as far as was possible. Now the nature of the Christian Worship shews evidently, that it came in the room of the Synagogue, which was moral, and not of the Temple-Worship, which was typical and ceremonial. Likewise, this parity of Customs betwixt the *Jews* and Christians, was such, that it made them be taken by the *Romans*, and other more overly observers, for one sect of Religion: and finally, any that will impartially read the New Testament, will find, that when the forms of Govern-

Government, or Worship are treated of, it is not done with such architectonical exactness, as was necessary, if a new thing had been instituted, which we find practiced by *Moses*. But the Apostles rather speak, as these who give rules for the ordering, and directing of what was already in being. From all which it seems well grounded and rational to assume, that the first constitution of the Christian Churches, was taken from the model of the Synagogue, in which these Elders were separated, for the discharge of their imployments, by an imposition of hands, as all *Jewish* Writers do clearly witness.

So the Presbyters of the Christian Church were ordained by an Imposition of hands. Their power was not only to preach, which (as I shewed already) was common to others, but also to administer Sacraments; so that it is true which *Jerome* saith, *Communi consilio Presbyterorum res gerebantur.*

We have already considered, how necessary it was judged, that no Ordination of Presbyters might be gone about without the presence and concurrence of the Bishop, as the principal Person, which was judged necessary (as I suppose) more upon the account of Unity and Order, than from the nature of the thing in its self: for taking things in themselves, it will follow, that

whatever power one hath, he may transmit to another; and therefore there seems to be small reason, why one who hath the power of preaching the Gospel, and administring Sacraments, may not also transmit the same to others: and it seems unreasonable so to appropriate this to a Bishop, as to annul these Ordinations which were managed by Presbyters, where Bishops could not be had. *Maimonides* saith, *Every one regularly ordained, hath power to ordain his Disciples also.*

There remains nothing to be cleared about this from Antiquity, save the 13 Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, which runs thus. Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους, (others read) πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως χωρὶς τῆς ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπισκόπου μὴ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. Others read ἐκδίκῃ παροικίᾳ.

Now the difficulty raised about this Canon is this, that if the reading be ἐκδίκῃ and πρεσβυτέρους, then it will follow, that the Presbyters of the City might have ordained without the Bishops presence, if they had his warrant in writing. Yea, they also infer, that it is probable that before that, they ordained even without the Bishops warrant, to which they were limited by this Canon: and upon this *Wallo Messalinus* triumphs not a little. But *Blondel* chused ra-

rather to read the Canon πρεσβυτέρους; as if the meaning of it were, that the *Chorepiscopi* could not have ordained either Presbyters or Deacons; nor the Presbyters of the City without the Bishops Warrant in writing; which will infer, that they might have done it being so warranted. It is true, *Binnius* hath read it so; so also hath *Gentianus Hervetus*, as appears by his *Latin* version of this Council. The *Arabick Manuscript* also favors this. And it is directly asserted by *Zonaras* on this Canon, and *Aristenus*.

But it is contradicted by the whole tract of Antiquity, whom we find all concurring in this, that the *Chorepiscopi* might neither ordain Presbyters, nor Deacons without a Bishop, as was cleared in its due place. Fut for that of *Wallo Messalinus*, it will appear to be ill grounded: For first, it is certain that the *Chorepiscopi* were a dignity above Presbyters. It will be therefore unreasonable to think that Presbyters could do that which was unlawful to the other. Besides, how bad an Inference is it from one Canon of a Provincial Council, of which there are such various readings, to argue for a thing which is not only without any other ground, but also contrary to the whole Current of Antiquity? And it was but few years after this, that in *Alexandria* the Ordinations given by *Coluthus*, who

was but a Presbyter, and only φαντάσεις τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, were annulled. Now *Ancyra* being in *Asia* the lesser, and divers Bishops out of *Syria* being there, in particular the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Cesarea*, who subscribed first; how came it that there was no notice of this had at *Alexandria*, to have prevented their severe Sentence in the Case of *Coluthus*?

But to consider the readings of the Canon, *Binius* reads it ἑτέρᾳ. so *Justellus*: it is true, he hath on the margin (*aliter* ἐνδέσῃ) *Hervetus* hath translated it, *in aliena Parochia*. Now if this be the true reading, the meaning of it will run thus. Whereas by a great many other Canons, Presbyters were so tied to their Bishop, that no Bishop was to receive the Presbyter of another Bishop, without his Bishops Warrant and Licence, and his *literæ pacificæ*, and *dimissoriæ*. So here the Presbyters of the City are discharged to go and assist at Ordinations, in other Parishes, without a written Licence from their own Bishop.

But as this Canon is read (ἐνδέσῃ) by some, so they seem to have added to it, μηδὲν περᾶσαι, or μηδὲν κινδῦναι; so that the meaning of it is, that the Presbyters of the City might do nothing without the Bishop's Warrant and Licence in writing: Thus have both *Isidorus Mercator*, and *Dionysius Exiguus* read it, as appears by their *La-*

tin

tin versions which are, *Sed nec Presbyteris civitatis (licet) sine Episcopi præcepto, aliquid amplius imperare, vel sine authoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochiâ aliquid agere.* And this is according to *Binius*'s Edition of them. But in another Edition of *Dionysius Exiguus* by *Justellus*, he seems to have read it simply ἐκδοσι, without any supplement.

Another old *Latin* Edition published by *Justellus* hath, *Sed neque Presbyteris civitatis licere, sine jussione Episcopi, sed cum ejusdem literis eundi ad singulas Parochias. Joannes Antiochen* in his *Collectio Canonum*, reads it simply ἐκδοσι παρεπιδ. *Ferrandus* in his *Breviatio Canonum*, Canon 92. cites this part of the Canon thus: *Ut Presbyteri civitatis, sine jussu Episcopi, nihil jubeant, nec in unaquaque Parœciâ aliquid agant. Alexius Aristinus* in his *Synopsis*, hath the first part of the Canon, but wants the second part. (And in his Gloss agrees with *Zonaras*, as was before observed.) And so doth *Simeon Logotheta*, in his *Epitome Canonum*. And by this diversity of reading, it will appear how little ground there is for founding any thing upon this Canon alone, especially when that alledged from it, is contradicted by undeniable Evidences.

But as Presbyters might not ordain without Bishops, so neither could Bishops ordain without the advice, consent, and concurrence of

their Presbyters *Conc. Carth. 4. Canon 22. Ut Episcopus, sine concilio Clericorum suorum, Clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium testimonium & conniventiam quærat.* And it was laid to *Chrysostom's* charge, ὅτι ἀνευ συνεδρίε καὶ ψήφε γνώμης τὸ κλῆρε ποιεῖ τὰς χειροτονίας. And in the *Roman Council* held by *Sylvester* (if credit be due to the Registers of that Council, which are indeed justly questionable) it was decreed, *cap.* 11. that one was to be ordained a Presbyter, *cum omnes Presbyteri declararent & firmarent, & sic ad ordinem Presbyterii accederet.* And none was to be made a Bishop, *nisi omnis Clerus expeteret uno voto perenni.*

It is likewise certain, that all things were done by the joint advice of Bishop and Presbyters. Neither were these wretched contests, of the limits of Power, much thought on, or tossed among them. The Bishops pretending to no more, than Presbyters were willing to yield to them; and Presbyters claiming no more than Bishops were ready to allow them. Their contentions lay chiefly with these that were without; those intestine Fewds and Broils being reserved for our unhappy days.

But as we find *Cyprian* amply declaring, how he resolved to do nothing without the consent of his Clergy, and People: so in the *African* Churches, that course continued longest in vigor.

vigor. Divers instances whereof appear in the 4. *Council* of *Carthage*; one I have already cited, to which I shall add three more, *Can.* 23. *Episcopus nullius causam audiat, absque præsentiâ Clericorum suorum, alioquin irrita erit sententia Episcopi, nisi Clericorum præsentiâ confirmetur.* *Can.* 34. *Episcopus in quolibet loco sedens, stare Presbyterum non patiatur.* And *Can.* 35. *Episcopus in Ecclesiâ, & in consessu Presbyterorum, sublimior sedeat; intra domum vero, collegam Prebyterorum sese esse cognoscat.*

There were two ranks of Presbyters, as clearly appears from the 13. Canon of *Neocesarea*, to wit, the Presbyters of the City, and the Presbyters of the Country. The former were the more eminent, in so far that the latter might not consecrate the Eucharist within the Church of the City in their presence, which appears from the cited Canon. Over the Presbyters of the Country were the *Chorepiscopi*, of whom already; but the Presbyters of the City being next at hand, were the Bishops Counsel, and advisers in all matters. The Bishop and they had the oversight of the Souls within the City. They were also to be maintained out of the Treasury of the Church, and were called *Canonici* or *Præbendarii*. The reason why they were called *Canonici*, was either, because of their regular observing of the course of Worship, and hours of Prayer

Prayer: or because of the distributions that were made among them, according to the Canon or Rule, and from the share that was assigned to them, called *Præbenda*, they got the name *Præbendarii.*

This *Consessus* or *Collegium Presbyterorum*, was afterwards designed by the barbarous word *Capitulum.* The chief over them, or the *Vice præses* next to the Bishop was called *Archipresbyter*, or *Decanus*, *Idem quod decurio, qui decem militibus præerat:* And insensibly the whole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction crept into their hands. The Presbyters of the Country either neglecting it, or being neglected in it. But without the *Capitulum*, nothing that the Bishop did was valid.

However, when the first fervor and vigor of Church-Discipline slacken'd: avarice and ambition creeping in apace into the Hearts of Churchmen, these *Chanoins* or *Præbends* not contented with their allowances out of the Church of the City, which were too small for their growing desires, got Churches in the Country annexed to them: and for most part serv'd them by Substitutes, except at the return of some solemn Festivities: and by this means it was that Church-Discipline fell totally into the Bishops hands; and the ancient model being laid aside, new Courts which were unknown to Antiquity, were set up. As these of the *Arch-dea-*

cons

cons, *Chancellors*, *Officials*, *Surrogates*, &c. However the *Præbends*, though they had deserted their Interest in Church-Discipline, yet two things they stuck to, because of the advantage and power that followed them.

The one was the capitular Elections of the Bishop, and the other was the meddling with, and disposing of the Church Revenues, and Treasure. But it was a gross Contradiction to the ends of Government, that the Bishop alone might manage the Spiritual part of his Charge, but must be limited to the advice of his Presbyters for the governing of the Temporality. Yet this was a farther proof of that saying, *Religio peperit divitias, & filia devoravit matrem.* And thus far we have seen what Interest Presbyters had within their own Parish, (mark that at first the Bishops Precinct was called *Parish*, and not *Diocese*) neither was the meeting of the Bishop with his Presbyters called a Synod: by which we see how weak that Allegiance is, that there were no *Diocesan Bishops* in the first Centuries, it being merely a playing with the word *Dioceses*.

But let us next consider what Interest *Presbyters* had in *Provincial* or *National Councils*. If that of the *Acts* 15. was a Synod, in it we have *Presbyter* subscribing with the Apostles. *Brethren* are also there added, not as if there had been

been any Laicks elected out of the Laity, such as these are who are now vulgarly called *Lay-Elders*, but some more eminent Christians, whom as the Apostles call'd then, so the Bishops continued afterward to consult and advise with in Ecclesiastick matters. But that Presbyters sate in Provincial Synods in the first and purest Ages, is undeniably clear. When *Victor* held the Council at *Rome* about the day of *Easter*, *Damasus* tells that it was *collatione facta cum Presbyteris & Diaconibus.* Likewise in the Council that *Cyprian* held, about the rebaptizing of Hereticks, there were present, *Episcopi plurimi ex provinciâ Africanâ, Numidiâ, Mauritaniâ, cum Presbyteris & Diaconibus, præsente etiam plebis maximâ parte.* And his contemporary *Firmilian*, whose Epistle is the 75. among *Cyprian*'s, tells us, how there were yearly Synods of Bishops and Presbyters, *Quâ ex causâ*, saith he, *necessario apud nos sit, ut per singulos annos seniores & Presbyteri*, (by which it is clear, that he can mean none, but Presbyters and Bishops) *in unum conveniamus, ad disponenda ea, quæ curæ nostræ commissa sunt.*

Eusebius lib. 6. *cap.* 35. tells, That upon the account of *Novatus*'s Schism, there was held at *Rome* σύνοδος μεγίστη, which consisted of sixty Bishops, and many more Presbyters, and Deacons, πλείονων δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ διακόνων. He likewise tells, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 27. How that

that upon *Samosatenus*'s Heresie, there was a great Synod held in *Antioch:* and after he hath set down the names of some Bishops there present, he adds, that there were μυεῖοι τε ἄλλοι ἅμα πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ διακόνοις. And their Synodal Letter is written in the name of the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons.

In the Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain*, there were 19. Bishops, *residentibus triginta sex Presbyteris, abstantibus Diaconibus & omni plebe.* In the Provincial Council at *Arles*, which judged in the matter of *Donatus*'s Schism, *Constantine* the Emperor being present, where were about two hundred Bishops from divers Nations, from *Italy, France, Spain, Sicily, Sardinia, Africk, Numidia*, and *Britain*, the Canons of that Council are subscribed by many Presbyters and Deacons. And if the Story of the Council of *Rome* under *Sylvester* be true, it is subscribed by 284. Bishops, 45. Presbyters, and 5. Deacons. Now all these being before the Council of *Nice*, evince that in the first and best ages, Presbyters voted and judged in Provincial Councils, and if in Provincials, why not in General ones?

The Council of *Nice* is subscribed by some *Chorepiscopi*, and one *Chorepiscopus* subscribes in the Council of *Ephesus*. And if *Chorepiscopi* be (as it is the opinion of some) in their natural dignity only Presbyters, then we have Presbyters

ters also subscribing General Councils. Besides that in the Council of *Constantinople*, and *Ephesus*, divers Bishops subscribed by Presbyters: from all which it is clear, that there is no ground from Antiquity to exclude Presbyters from a Suffrage in national and general Councils: and it is but a frivolous distinction that they may have a consultative, tho not a deliberative Suffrage, since we see them subscribing both the decisions of Faith and Canons of discipline.

The next thing to be examined, is the qualification, election, and ordination of Presbyters. For their qualification, great care was used to train them up long in an abstracted and devote Life, that so they might be well prepared for that holy Function. And therefore it was, that many of the Primitive Bishops lived in Monasteries among them, whom they were educating for holy Orders, as appears from the Lives of *Basil*, *Augustine*, and *Martin:* Neither was one to be ordained a Presbyter, but after a long probation and tryal, and all these degrees, of which we shall speak afterward, were so many steps and preparations through which all were to go, before they could be initiated. And indeed it seems against reason, at first step to ordain a man Presbyter, and commit the care of Souls to him, before a long previous probation had of him.

Therefore the ancient Monasteries, as they were

were Sanctuaries for such as designed to leave the World, and live devoutly, so they were also Colleges for the Education of Churchmen. It is true, the years of Probation may seem too too many; but they ordinarily dispensed in that, as they found Persons worthy and qualified. But none might be Presbyter before he were thirty years of age, according to the Council of *Neocesarea*, even tho he were highly worthy (πάνυ ἀξίῳ.) And the reason given for this, is, because *Christ* was thirty years of age before he entred upon the discharge of his holy Function.

Likewise a *Clinicus*, that is, one baptised in sickness, by the twelfth Canon of *Neocesarea*, could not have been a Presbyter, because he was not a Christian, ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης. And this was not to be dispensed with, but upon his following Faith and Diligence, or that others could not be had.

And in the *Canon Law*, *dist.* 77. *cap. Siquis*, among other prerequisites for a Presbyter, one is: *Si pœnitentiam publicam non gesserit*, holding that any gross scandal committed after Baptism, should be a bar upon a Man from being ordained a Presbyter.

As also *Dist.* 56. *cap.* 1. the Children of Presbyters are discharged to be ordained: *Presbyterorum filios à sacris altaris ministeriis removemus, nisi aut in Cœnobiis, aut in Canonicis religiosè probati fuerint*

fuerint conversari. It is like, this was either to discourage the marriage of Churchmen, or to obviate the scandal might have been taken, if they had been partial to their own Children. Yet this was neither old nor universal; for *Nazianzen* was both a Presbyter and a Bishop, though a Bishop's Son. And in the next Chapter of that same *Dist.* many instances are alledged by *Damasus* to the contrary.

Further, none who had been Soldiers, and were *Curiales*, and *obstricti curiæ*, could have been ordained without a dimission, and that they had been fifteen years in a Monastery, and three parts of four of their Estate were adjudged to the fisk; so *Dist.* 53. and *Justinian* 123. *Nov.* Now this might be first, lest any weary of the service to which they were obliged, should upon that pretence shake it off, and run from their colors, or other employments. But next, that men who had been much involved in the World, and particularly men of bloud, might not enter into holy Orders, without a long precedent change of the course of their life; it not being easie to pass of a sudden from a course of secularity, to that sublimity of holiness which is necessary for such a sacred Function.

And finally, all *ambitus* was condemned in Presbyters, as well as in Bishops, though we see both from *Chrysostom*'s Books *de Sacerdotio*, and *Nazian-*

Nazianzen's *Apologetick*, that there was enough of it among both kinds. Yet many there were who resisted the Calls given them to Church-Offices with great earnestness, some flying from them to the Wilderness, as from a persecution: some cutting off their Noses, and other members, that they might be thought unworthy of it; some continued to the end in their refusal: others were not ordained without being haled even by force; many receiving this sacred imposition of hands with trembling and many tears. And indeed were the greatness of the charge more weighed, and the secular advantages less looked at, it is like there might be yet need of some force to draw men to accept of it; whereas all are so forward to rush toward it, blown up with pride, or provoked by covetousness.

We saw already how averse *Nazianzen* was from entring in sacred Orders: but no less memorable is the History of *Chrysostome*, who (with his Friend *Basil*) having engaged in a Monastick life, was struck with fear when a rumour rose that they were both to be ordained Presbyters. (And by the way observe, that he calls it τὸ ἐπίσκοπης ἀξίωμα.) But *Chrysostome* was silent, lest the expressing of his aversion should have deterred *Basil*; and his his silence was judged by *Basil* a consent, and so proved one of his

chief inducements to accept of Orders. But when the day came wherein *Chrysostome* knew that the Bishops designed to ordain them, he withdrew privately, so that he could not be found: yet the Bishops upon another pretence, carried *Basil* to the Church, and there ordained him, much against his mind.

But when he first met with his Friend *Chrysostome*, he melted down in tears, challenging him severely for his withdrawing from him; whereof *Chrysostome* gives his Apology at large in these six excellent Books of his *de Sacerdotio*; wherein by way of Dialogue betwixt him and his Friend, he layeth out the great dignity and weight of that Charge, chiefly in the third Book, where he shews, *That a Priest should be like one of the Angels of GOD*, *cap.* 4. And he blames these Elections that were rashly made, *cap.* 10. upon which he charges most of the disorders that were then in the Church. And *cap.* 11. he confesseth how guilty himself was of that unlawful *ambitus* for Church employment; which being yet unmortified in him, did frighten him from entring in holy Orders. *Cap.* 14. he saith, *Episcopum convenit studio acri & perpetuâ vitæ continentia tanquam adamantinis armis obseptum esse.* In the fourth Book he speaks of the great caution was to be used in Elections and Ordinations, complaining that in these, *Regard was rather had*

to

to Riches and Honor, than true worth. Through the fifth Book he shews the great evil and hazard of popular applause, and the sin of being much pleased with it. And *lib.* 6. *cap.* 2. he hath that excellent saying, *That the soul of the Priest should be purer than the very beams of the Sun themselves.* Καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀκτίνων αὐτῶν καθαρωτέραν τῷ ἱερεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι δεῖ. And *cap.* 12. he accuses himself of his vain desires and other faults, whence it was that he had so great a horrour of attempting at that for which he knew himself so unworthy: preoccupying that Objection, that a Man in that is to submit to the judgment of others, by the Examples of one who hath no skill in Physick, and knowing himself ignorant, is not to administer Physick, though all the World should desire him to undertake a Cure, declaring their Opinion and confidence of his skill: for if upon another mans opinion of his skill he should offer to meddle in it, and give Physick, he might as well kill as cure. So neither one unacquainted in military affairs, was to undertake the leading of an Army, knowing his own unfitness, though never so much solicited to it: whence he subsumes more strongly, that none should undertake the leading of Souls, as long as he knew his own unfitness, were the importunities and solicitations of others never so many. And so far of the qualifications of

those who were to be ordained Presbyters.

Their Election hath been touched already, for it went the same way with the Elections of Bishops, and so was partly popular, at least was to be ratified by the approbation, and consent of the people. *Possidius in vita Augustini*, tells how he was chosen a Presbyter by the people.

We have the Ordination of the Presbyters set down thus, *Conc. Carth.* 4. *Canon.* 3. *Presbyter quum ordinatur, Episcopo eum benedicente, & manum super caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præsentes sunt, manus suas juxta manum Episcopi super caput illius teneant. Dionysius* the *Areopagite* in the forecited place tells, That the Presbyter whom he calls ἱερεὺς, was ordained in the same form that a Bishop was ordained, save only that the Gospel was not laid on his head. From which simplicity of the primitive forms, we may see, how far they were from all these superstitious Fopperies now used in the *Romish Church* in Ordination. And so much concerning Presbyters.

Deacons are next to be treated of. The Original of them is by the general current of the Ancients taken from the *Levites* under the Temple, and therefore in not a few of the antient *Councils*, they go under that designation. But as was formerly observed, it is more probable, that the Christian Church took its immediate Model from

from the Synagogue, tho that might have been taken from the Temple. Now in the Synagogue, as there was a Bishop and Presbyters, so there were also Deacons called *Parnasin.* There were three of them in each Synagogue, two were to gather the Collections, and all the three together did distribute them.

The first Origine of them in the Christian Church is set down, *Acts* 6. where their primitive institution shews, that their first design was for looking to the necessities of the poor, who had been neglected in the daily distribution of the Charity, and there they are called *Διάκονοι.* It is true, that term *Luke* 4. 20. is used in another sense, for there the *Minister of the Synagogue,* to whom *CHRIST* delivered the Book, could be no other, than their *Chazan* or Bishop, whose Office it was to call out any to read the Law in the Synagogue. But since all Church-Office is for service, and not for domination, Christ himself not coming *to be ministred unto, but to minister,* it is no wonder, if that term should then have been promiscuously used. We also find S. *Paul* applying to himself (1 *Cor.* 4. a term equivalent to this.) But though the primitive institution of *Deacons* import only their looking to the necessities of the poor: yet from the *Levites* ministring to the Priest in the Sacrifices, it came to be generally received and used,

the Deacons should serve the Bishops and Presbyters in the administration of the Sacraments.

The institution of them doth also discover, that they were persons to be separated for that holy service, and consecrated for it by an imposition of hands; and so were to be no more secular, but Ecclesiastical persons: and the usual practice of the Church was to account that Office a step, degree and probation, in order to ones being made a Presbyter. And therefore our mungrel *Lay-Deacons* differ vastly, both from the first institution of the Scripture, and current of all Antiquity.

The *Areopagite* gives the account of their Ordinations thus: *That the Deacon being brought to the Bishop, kneeled down on one knee, and so received imposition of hands.* The fourth Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage* is: *Diaconus quum ordinatur, solus Episcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum super caput illius ponat; quia non ad Sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium consecratur.*

As for their Election, at the first institution they were chosen by the whole Body of the people, so *Acts 6.* And tho the people were barred their suffrage in the choice of other Church-Officers, yet there might be good reason why they should still chuse the Deacons, their Office being almost wholly temporal, to

receive

receive and distribute the peoples alms. But whatever right people might pretend to in this, it will never be proved that by divine Right, the people should chuse those who had the charge of their souls. For reason would infer, that none could make a choice, who were not able to give a judgment of the qualifications, and worth of a Churchman, that being peculiar to the Clergy. And hence it is that more than a consent cannot be justly pretended to by the people. But after all this, if this place prove any thing, it will prove in favor of the whole body of the people, and not of a few selected *Lay-Elders.*

All the Deacons were in their degree and order inferiour to Presbyters, which will appear from these Canons of the 4 *Council* of *Carthage*, Canon 37. *The Deacon is declared to be the Minister of the Presbyter, as well as of the Bishop.* Canon 39. *He might sit in the presence of a Presbyter, if desired by him.* Canon 40. *In conventu Presbyterorum Diaconus interrogatus, loquatur*; so that he might not speak, except desired. It is therefore a disorder in Church-discipline, that the Archdeacon should not only be a Presbyter, but also exercise Jurisdiction over Presbyters. And therefore *Petrus Blesensis, Epist.* 123. hath well observed, how *turbato ordine dignitatis, Archidiaconi hodie Sacerdotibus præeminent, & in eos vim ac potestatem suæ Jurisdictionis exercent.*

Jerome is the first that makes mention of these *Arch deacons*, telling how the *Deacons* did chuse one of their number to be over them, *quem Archidiaconum vocabant*: and in the same Epistle to *Evagrius*, he severely inveighs against those *Deacons*, who pretend to an equality with, or preference over Presbyters, saying: *Quid patitur mensarum & viduarum Minister, ut supra eos tumidus sese efferat, ad quorum preces corpus sanguisque Christi conficitur.*

Because of the first number, *Seven*, the custom was to have but seven *Deacons* in a City were it never so great: so it was decreed in the Council of *Neocesarea* 14. Canon. Their Office was chiefly to look to the poor, and to serve in the administration of the Sacraments. *Justin Martyr* in the end of his second *Apology* tells, That the *Eucharist was sent by the Deacons to such as were absent. Cyprian lib.* 3. *Epist.*15. reckons it as a part of the *Deacon*'s Office *to wait upon the Martyrs*, and *Epist.*17. of that same Book, he tells, That where there was no Presbyter, *& urgere exitus cœperit. The Deacon might receive the Exhomologesis of penitents, and absolve them by imposition of hands. Optatus lib.*2. calls them the *Defenders of the holy Table*; telling how the *Donatists* had broken through the roof of a Church, and had killed and wounded some of the *Deacons*, who preserved the holy Elements from their sacrilegious attempt. The

The *Deacons* distributed the Eucharist, and sometime they did give it to the Presbyters, but that was forbidden by the 18. *Can.* of the Council of *Nice.* Yet in the fourth Council of *Carthage, Can.* 38. *Diaconus, præsente Presbytero, Eucharistiam corporis Christi populo si necessitas cogat, jussus eroget. Cyril* of *Jerusalem* in his 17. Catechism, counts the *Deacon* the Minister of Baptism, as well as the Bishop or Presbyter. And certain it is, that generally Baptism was administred by the *Deacons,* as well as by the Presbyters.

Some parts of the publick Worship were also discharged by the *Deacons. Chrysostome hom.* 14. *ad Rom.* tells, that *the Deacons offered prayers for the people*; and *hom.* 17. *ad Heb.* he tells, *That the Deacons stood in a high place at the administration of the Eucharist, and calling with a terrible voice, as Heraulds, invited some, and rejected others from these holy mysteries.* And thus far I have given an account of the sense which the Ancients had of the Offices of *Bishop, Presbyter,* and *Deacon,* which three were the only ones they accounted Sacred and Divine. And this held good even at the time, that the *Areopagites*'s pretended Books were written (I call them pretended, because there is none now so simple as to believe them his) for he reckons the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy to consist in these three degrees.

To this account given of *Deacons,* I shall add some

somewhat of *Deaconesses*, of whom mention is made, *Rom.* 16. 1. where *Phebe* is called ἡ διάκονος, the *Deaconess of the Church of Cenchrea.* They are likewise so called in the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*; but more ordinary in ancient Writings διακονίσσα. *Jerome* on that place to the *Romans*, speaking of *Phebe*, understands her to have been a *Deaconess*: and adds, *Etiam nunc in Orientalibus Diaconissæ mulieres in suo sexu ministrare videntur, in baptismo, sive in ministerio verbi, quia privatim docuisse fœminas invenimus sicut Priscillam.* He likewise understood the Widows mentioned, 1 *Tim.* 5. to be Diaconesses: *Tales eligi voluit Diaconissas quæ omnibus essent exemplum vivendi.* *Origen* likewise takes it as undoubted, that *Phebe* had a particular office in the Church of *Cenchrea*: and saith on that place, *Hic locus Apostolica authoritate docet etiam fœminas in ministerio Ecclesiæ constitui, in quo officio positam Phœben apud Ecclesiam quæ est Cenchreis.* *Chrysostome* likewise understood it to be an Office: And saith on that place, καὶ τὸ ἀξιώμα περιέθηκε, διάκονον εἰπών. If any credit be due to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, they tell us many things of their Office, tho with a great alloy of much idle stuff. They tell, *That no Woman might come to a Bishop or Presbyter, except in the company of a Deaconess*, Lib. 2. cap. 26. *And that they were to go to Womens Houses to instruct them, which had been scandalous for Churchmen,*

Lib. 3.

Lib.3.cap.15. *They did likewise receive them in Baptism, Cap.* 16. *And kept the gates by which Women entred into the Church,* Lib.8. cap.28. So it seems their Office was to instruct and teach Women. And so S. *Paul,* Phil. 4.3. speaks of *Women who laboured with him in the Gospel.* And *Rom.* 16. we find mention not only of *Priscilla, but of Triphona, Triphosa and Persis, who laboured in the Lord.* And it is like their Office was also to minister to the necessities of Churchmen: and therefore when S. *Paul* speaks of *leading about a Sister and a Wife, as well as other Apostles,* he may be well understood to speak of one of those who might both have supplied his wants, and assisted him in the conversion of Women; but for eviting scandal, they were not to be under sixty years of age.

Mention is made of them by *Pliny, lib.*10. *Epist.*97. who writing to *Trajan,* of the enquiry he was making of the Christians, saith, *Necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur quid esset veri & per tormenta quærere.* They were received by an Ordination in *Tertullian*'s time: for he speaking of them, saith, *(De castit. cap.* 13.) *Ordinari in Ecclesia solent.* And *ad uxorem, lib.* 1. *cap.*7. *Viduam allegi in ordinationem nisi univiram non concedit.* The 19. Canon of the Council of *Nice,* reckons the Deaconesses among those that were ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, but saith that they

they had no imposition of hands, so that in all things they were reckoned among the Laicks; but hints that they had a particular habit, calling them τῶν ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξεπαδιστῶν. *Balsamon*'s Gloss on this is, that the Virgins who dedicated themselves to *GOD*, continued in a Laical habit till they were forty years of age; and were then, if found worthy, ordained Deaconesses, by a particular imposition of hands. To this *Zonaras* adds, that the Virgins in the twenty fifth year of their age, got a particular habit from the Bishop. The 74 Canon of *Nice*, according to the *Arabick* Edition, appoints the Office of a *Deaconess* to be only the receiving of Women in Baptism. *Epiph. hæres.* 79. after he hath proved that a Woman is not capable of the publick service of the Church, adds, That the Order of the *Deaconesses* was instituted out of reverence to that Sex, that when the Womans body was naked in Baptism, they might not be so seen by the Priest. And with this agrees the 12th Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage*: *Viduæ vel sanctimoniales quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto & sano sermone docere imperitas & rusticas mulieres tempore quo baptizandæ sint, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, & qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.* This is also confirmed by the 6. *Chap.* of the 6. *Novel*, which appoints the age

age both for Virgins and Widows to be fifty years: *Sicque sacram promereri ordinationem.* And their Office is denied to be *adorandis ministrare baptismatibus, & aliis adesse secretis quæ in venerabilibus ministeriis per eas rite aguntur.* And the rest of that Chapter gives divers other rules concerning them.

The 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*, appoints a *Deaconess* not to be ordained till she were forty years of age (it is πρεσβυτιδα in the Canon) and it is appointed that it be done after a strict examination; but that after she was ordained, and continued some time in the Ministery, if she gave her self in Marriage, she (as one that had reproached the grace of GOD) was to be anathematized with her Husband. *Zonaras* reconciles this age with the Apostle, that the Apostle speaks of Widows, and this Canon of Virgins, tho it be γυναῖκα in the Canon. Yet it seems some of these *Deaconesses* have given scandal in the Church, and perhaps proved like the Females among the *Pharisees*, whom the *Rabbins* reckoned among these who destroyed the World: And so we find the *Western* Church being scandalized at some miscarriages in this Order, they are discharged to be ordained by the first Council of *Orange*, *Can.* 26. *Diaconissæ omnimodo non ordinandæ, si quæ jam sunt benedictioni quæ populo impenditur, capita submittunt.*

And

And in the beginning of the sixth *Century*, it seems they gave great scandal; for Canon 22. Council *Epaun.* they are simply discharged: *Viduarum consecrationem quas Diaconas vocant ab omni regione nostra penitus abrogamus, solam eis pœnitentiæ benedictionem si converti ambiant imponendo.* And *Anno* 536. *Con. Aurel.* 2. *Can.* 17. *Benedictio Diaconatus*, is said to be given to the Women *contra interdicta Canonum.* And the next Canon of that Council is, *Placuit etiam ut nulli postmodum fœminæ Diaconalis benedictio pro conditionis hujus fragilitate credatur.* Yet they are mentioned in the Council of *Worms* in the year 868. Canon 73. where the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* is wholly insert. One scandal we find occasioned by these *Deaconesses*, was, that they presumed to distribute the Elements in the Eucharist; which *Gelasius* blames in his ninth Epistle written to the Bishops of *Lucania*, *Quod fœminæ sacris altaribus ministrare ferantur.* And this it seems hath continued longer: For we find *Ratherius* of *Verona* in the tenth *Century*, appoints in his Synodal Epistle (which in the Tomes of the Councils is printed as a Sermon of Pope *Leo* the fourths) *Nulla fœmina ad altare Domini accedat.* And *Matthæus Blastaris* in his *Syntagma, lit.* T. *cap.* 11. concludes it to be unknown what the Office of the *Deaconesses* was. Some judged that they ministred to Women,

men, who being in age received Baptism, it being accounted a crime for a Man to see a Woman naked. Others thought that they might enter to the Altar, and exercise the Office of *Deacons*, who proved this from many things, particularly from some words of *Nazianzen*'s Oration at his Sisters Funeral, but that was afterwards forbidden διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐμμήνων ἀπεφαίξειν ῥύσιν; yet he doubts much the truth of that, it not agreeing with reason, that Women who were not suffered publickly to teach, should be admitted to the Office of a *Deacon*, whose duty it was by the ministery of the word, to purifie these who were to be baptized. And after that he gives an account of the form of their Ordination.

Mention likewise is made of them in the *Council in Trullo*, *Canon* 14. *A Deaconess was not to receive imposition of hands, before she was forty years of age.* Which is more expresly appointed in the 40. Canon, where they decree, that though the Apostle made the age 60. yet the Canons had allowed their Ordination at 40. because they found the Church was become firmer in the grace of *GOD*, and had advanced forward: and by the 48. Canon of that *Council*, a Bishop's Wife, when separated from her Husband by consent, was to live in a Monastery, and if found worthy might be made a *Deaco-*

nesse.

ness. *Basil* by his 18. Canon allows Virgins to be received at the sixteenth or seventeenth year of their age, but by his 24. he reckons it a fault to receive a Widow into the Order under 60: yet it seems that was not peremptorily observed. For in his 44. Canon he speaks of *Deaconesses* found in Fornication, who might not be allowed to communicate before seven years had been past in penitence. Whence this Order failed in the *Greek* Church, we know not; but *Balsamon* on the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* tells, That in his time *Deaconesses* were no more ordained, and his reason is, because no Woman was suffered to enter unto the Altar, though (saith he) some Women were abusively so called.

As for the inferiour degrees of *Subdeacon, Acolyth,* &c. as they were only *Juris Ecclesiastici,* so they were not designed for any sacred performance, nor had they any holy Character upon them: but were intended as steps for those whom they were training up to sacred employments, and were but like the degrees given in Universities. No mention is made of them in the first two *Centuries: Ignatius* is expres that there is no intermedial step betwixt the Laick, and the *Deacon,* which stile we also meet in all the Fathers before *Cyprian*'s time.

He, Epistle 24. speaks of the *Lectors* and *Subdeacons,* telling how he had ordained *Saturus* a Lector,

Lector, and *Optatus* a Subdeacon, *quos jam communi consilio Clero proximos feceramus.* And of the *Lectors*, he saith, Epist. 34. *Cæterum Presbyterii honorem nos illis designasse sciatis.* And by what follows, it is clear he means of a share in the maintenance of the Church. Epistle 28. he speaks of the *Subdeacons* and *Acolyths*, shewing how they likewise had a share in the divisions of the offerings made to the Church. Epistle 33. he tells of one *Aurelius*, who had been twice a Confessor in the persecution, whom he had ordained a Lector, apologizing that he had done it without the consent of his Clergy and people. *In ordinationibus solemus vos antè consulere, & voces ac merita communi consilio ponderare; sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum præcedant suffragia divina.* And after he hath laid out the merits of the Person, he adds, *Placuit tamen ut ab officio Lectionis incipiat, quia & nihil magis congruit voci quæ Dominum gloriosâ prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare.* Of the same strain is his following Epistle concerning *Celerinus*, who had refused to be ordained a Lector, until he was persuaded to it by a divine Revelation in the Night. Likewise in his 76. Epistle, he makes mention of *Exorcists*: who are also mentioned by *Firmilian* in his Epistle, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprians*. And at the

same time *Cornelius*, the Bishop of *Rome*, in his Epistle (insert by *Eusebius*, *lib.*6. *cap.*43.) wherein he gives account of the Clergy were then at *Rome*; tells, That *there were* 46 *Presbyters*, 7 *Deacons*, 42 *Acolyths*, 50 *Exorcists*, *Lectors*, and *Porters*. These inferiour Orders we see were then in the Church. And since we have no earlier accounts of them, we may conclude their rise to have been about this time. A short account will suffice for their several employments, which will be best gathered from the several Canons of the 4th Council of *Carthage*.

Canon 5. *Subdiaconus quum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patinam de Episcopi manu accipiat vacuam, & calicem vacuum. De manu vero Archidiaconi urceolum cum aquâ, & mantile, & manutergium.* So his Office was to look to the Vessels for the Eucharist, and to serve the *Deacons* in that work.

Canon 6. *Acolythus quum ordinatur ab Episcopo quidem doceatur, qualiter in officio suo agere debeat. Sed ab Archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo ut sciat se ad accendenda Ecclesiæ luminaria mancipari, accipiat & urceolum vacuum, ad suggerendum vinum in Eucharistiam sanguinis Christi.* As for these *Cerei*, they shall be spoken of upon the next Canon. The work of *Acolythus* was to light the Candles, and provide the Wine: And from the *ratio nominis*, we may believe

lieve their Office was particularly to wait upon the Bishop, and follow him.

Canon 8. *Lector quum ordinatur, faciat de illo verbum Episcopus ad plebem, indicans ejus fidem ac vitam, atque ingenium. Posthæc spectante plebe tradat ei codicem, de quo lecturus est, dicens ad eum: accipe, & esto lector verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter & utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis, qui verbum Dei ministraverunt.* And by what hath been already cited out of *Cyprian* compared with this, it appears, that the Office of the *Lector* was judged that of the greatest importance of them all.

Canon 9. *Ostiarius quum ordinatur postquam ab Archidiacono instructus fuerit, qualiter in domo Dei debeat conversari, ad suggestionem Archidiaconi, tradat & Episcopus claves Ecclesiæ de altario, dicens: sic age, quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.*

Canon 10. *Psalmista, id est, Cantor potest absque scientia Episcopi, solâ jussione Presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi Presbytero; vide, ut quod ore cantas, corde credas; & quod corde credis, operibus comprobes.* Now the *Psalmistæ* were these that were the Singers, for it was appointed in the Council of *Laodicea*, that none might sing in the Church, εἰ μὴ οἱ πεὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα, that is, those of the *suggestum*, or Pulpit.

But because the 7. Canon will afford more matter of question, I have reserved it last. *Exorcista quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu Episcopi libellum, in quo scripti sunt Exorcismi, dicente sibi Episcopo: accipe, & commenda memoriæ, & habeto potestatem imponendi manum super Energumenum, sive baptizatum, sive Catechumenum.*

But for examining this of the *Exorcist*, we must run a little back. The *Jews* under the second Temple were much addicted to Magick. In the *Talmud* it is given as a necessary qualification of one that might be of the *Sanhedrin*, that he should be skilled in all Magick doctrines and charms. And in the inner Court of the Temple, called the *Court of Israel*, there was a Chamber said to have been built by one *Parva* a Magician, by the Art of Magick, from whom it was called *Happarva*: And much of what they say of the *Bath-col*, seems to hint that it was an effect of Magick. Many places are also cited out of the *Talmud*, of their *Rabbies* killing one another by that Art; and so highly do they extol it, that many of them thought that all Miracles were wrought by the exact knowledg of the Cabbalistick Arts, and it is well enough known how that abounded among the Heathens. *Ulpian* made a Law against these Physicians who cured Diseases by Exorcisms.

We see our *LORD* triumphed over the powers

powers of darkness, who were then raging through the World: and that the Oracles were silenced at this time, is confessed by Heathens. Neither did this gift of casting out Devils, conferred by our *LORD* on his Disciples, die with them, but remain some ages in the Church.

Tertullian speaks of it as a Gift communicated to all Christians. *De coronâ mil.* he tells, That some Soldiers did *exorcismis fugare spiritus malignos:* and *de Idololatriâ, cap.* 11. *Quo ore Christianus Thurarius* (this is one that offered incense to Idols) *si per templa transibit, fumantes aras despuet, & exsufflabit, quibus ipse prospexit: quâ constantiâ exorcizabit alumnos suos, quibus domum suam cellariam præstat.* So that he hath understood this Power of exorcizing to have been the effect of every sincere Christian's Prayer.

Origen in his 35. *tract.* on *Matth.* condemns the form of doing it, by adjuring the Devils, saying that *CHRIST* hath given us power to command them. *Est enim Judaicum adjurare Dæmonia.*

Cyprian speaks of an Exorcism ordinarily preceding Baptism; but prefers the vertue of Baptism to that of Exorcism, *Epist.* 76. *Hodie etiam geritur, ut per Exorcistas voce humanâ & potestate divinâ flagelletur, & uratur, & torqueatur Diabolus; & cum exire se & dimittere homines DEI sæpe dicat: in eo tamen quod dixerit, fallat* ——

Cum tamen ad aquam salutarem, &c. And *ad Demetrianum,* he saith, *O si audire eos velles, & videre, quando à nobis adjurantur & torquentur spiritalibus flagris, & verborum tormentis, de obsessis corporibus, ejiciuntur; quando ejulantes & gementes voce humanâ, & potestate divinâ flagella, & verbera sentientes, venturum judicium confitentur.* And much of this nature is to be met with among the primitive Writers, which shews that the power of Exorcising was an Authority over Devils.

Yet if this had been a formal Office, Reason will say it should rather have been among the highest than lowest Orders, the work being so great and miraculous. But from the *Areopagite,* and others, we are told, that before Baptism there was used a renunciation of the Devil, with a Prayer for casting him out: And there is some probability that these called *Exorcists* were only *Catechists,* who had some formuls, whereby they taught, such as they instructed, to renounce the Devil: and this with the Prayer that accompanied it, was called an *Exorcism.*

Nazianz. Orat. in Bapt. Ne exorcismi medicinam asperneris, nec ob illius prolixitatem animo concidas, nam vel ut lapis quidam Lydius est, ad quem exploratur, quam sincero quisque pectore ad baptismum accedat.

Cyril

Cyril of *Jerusalem*, *Præfat. in Catech. Festinent pedes tui ad catecheses audiendas, exorcismos studiose suscipe, etiamsi exorcizatus & inspiratus jam sis, salubris enim est tibi res ista.* The Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 26. discharged all to *exorcize either in Churches or Houses, except these appointed for it by the Bishops.* And by the tenth Canon of *Antioch*, the *Rural Bishops* are warranted to constitute *Exorcists*, from which we see they could not esteem that a wonder-working Office. And *Balsamon* in his *Sholion*, makes them one with the Catechists, ἐφορκισὰς ἤτοι κατηχητὰς. and on the Canon of *Laodicea*, ἐφορκίζειν τετέστι κατηχεῖν ἀπίστες. And towards the end of his Gloss on that Canon, he saith, *That an Exorcist though appointed by the* Chorepiscopus, *and not by the Bishop*, κωλὼς κατηχήσει. And *Beveregius* cites *Harmenopolus* to the same purpose on the tenth Canon of *Antioch*. From these evidences it is most probable to think, that the *Exorcists* at first were nothing but Catechists; but afterwards, as all things do in any tract of time degenerate, they became corrupt, beyond perhaps either these of the *Jews* or the *Gentiles*; so that the Books of *Exorcisms* now in the *Roman* Church, are so full of Bombast terms, and odd Receipts, that they are a stain to the Christian Church.

And it is the most preposterous thing can

be imagined, that what was given in the New Testament for the greatest confirmation of the Christian faith, should be made a constant Office, and put in so mean hands. And to this I need not add the base Arts and Cheats discovered among that sort of people.

I shall conclude this long tedious Account of the sense the Ancient Church had of the several Officers in it, with some words of *Tertullian*, which I shall barely set down, without any descant on them, tho they have occasioned much perplexity to divers good Antiquaries. *Tertullian in exortatione ad uxorem, cap.* 7. saith: *Nonne & laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes DEO & Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem & plebem constituit Ecclesiæ authoritas, & honor per Ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Ideo ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est consessus, & offers, & tingis & Sacerdos es tibi solus, sed ubi tres sunt, Ecclesia est, licet laici.* But others read these words differently, their Copies having them thus: *Sanctificatus à DEO. Ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis est consessus, & offert, & tingit, Sacerdos qui est ibi solus: sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici.*

FINIS.

PO-

POLYHISTOR TO BASILIUS.

YOUR desire, and my own promise, have engaged me to send you the enclosed Papers: For the trouble the reading them may give you, my Apology lies in my Obedience; and yet I have contracted things as much as I could, and perhaps have exceeded in my abridging: For had I let loose my Pen in a descant on every particular, these few Sheets had swelled to a Volume. And my design was not to act the Critick, but to be a faithful Historian. These gleanings were intended partly for my own use, and partly for the direction of some under my charge in the study of Antiquity; and were written some years ago, when I had no thoughts of making them

them more publick, than by giving a few tranſcripts of them. But now I leave the Midwifry of them to you, that you may either ſtifle this Embryo, or give it a freer Air to breath in. I have here only given you what related to the conſtitution and modelling of Churches, referring to my Obſervations on other Canons, matters that come to be treated more properly upon their Texts, as *of the adminiſtration of all the parts of the Paſtoral charge, of all their forms in Worſhip, and Church-Diſcipline, of their zeal againſt Hereſies and Schiſms, together with the methods uſed for reclaiming them; and of the poverty, ſimplicity, abſtraction from ſecular affairs, and ſublime ſanctity of the primitive Biſhops and Presbyters.* Theſe with many other particulars, if well examined, as they will make the Work ſwell to a huge bulk, ſo they will bring pleaſure, as well as advantage, to ſuch as deſire a better Acquaintance with the ſtate of the Church of *GOD* in her beſt times; but what through the entanglements of affairs, and other avocations, what through their want of Books, are not able to engage in ſo laborious an enquiry by ſearching the Fountains themſelves.

I aſſure you, I have not gone upon truſt, having taken my Obſervations from the Writings

tings themſelves, that I have vouched for my Warrants. I once intended to have cited all the Teſtimonies I brought in *Engliſh*; and ſo to have avoided the pedantry of a *Babyloniſh Dialect*, as the *French* begin now to write. But obſerving that the foul play many have committed, hath put a jealouſie in moſt Readers of theſe Citations, where the Author's words are not quoted, I chuſed rather to hazard on the cenſure of being a Pedant, than of an unfaithful wreſter in my Tranſlations. Only to ſave the Writer the labour of writing much *Greek*, which I found unacceptable, I do often cite the *Latin* tranſlations of the *Greek Authors*. I ſhall only add, that as I was cauſing write out theſe Papers for you, there came to my hands one of the beſt Works this Age hath ſeen, *Beveregius his Synopſis Canonum*. I quickly looked over theſe learned Volumes, that I might give theſe Sheets ſuch improvements as could be borrowed from them, which indeed were not inconſiderable.

I detain you too long, but ſhall importune you no more. I leave this to your Cenſure, which I know to be ſeverely Critical in all ſuch matters. Your judgment being the wonder of all who know you, eſpecially who conſider how little your leiſure allows you, to look unto

to things so far without the Orb you move in: though nothing be without the vast Circle of your comprehensive understanding, if you let loose these Papers to a more publick view, let this Paper accompany them, which may some way express the zeal of your faithfullest Servant, who humbly bids you *Adieu*.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division.....

Section.....

Shelf..... *Number*.....